

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096564 5

BASIL'S SEM
TRANSFERRE
†





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

A Monthly Journal,

UNDER EPISCOPAL SANCTION.

THIRD SERIES.

VOLUME XII.—1891.

“ Ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis.”

“ As you are children of Christ, so be you children of Rome.”

Ex Dictis S. Patricii, Book of Armagh, fol. 9.

DUBLIN :
BROWNE & NOLAN, NASSAU-STREET.

1891.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

THE IRISH

ECOLOGICAL RECORD

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

UNDER EDITORIAL SUPERVISION

Nihil Obstat.

GIRALDUS MOLLOY, S.T.D.,
CENSOR DEP.

Imprimatur.

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublin., Hiberniae Primas.



FEB 20 1954

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
American Literature. By Rev. T. Lée	1121
An Early English Prymer. By Orby Shipley, M.A.	786
Anecdota Oxoniensia. By Rev. B. MacCarthy, D.D.	147
"Anima Deo Unita." By Rev. J. S. Vaughan	1057
Apostleship of Prayer, The : its Origin, Progress, and Organization. By Rev. J. Cullen, S.J.	928, 1003
Aristotle and Catholic Philosophy. By Rev. T. E. Judge	442
Campion's, The Blessed Edmund, "History of Ireland" and its Critics. By Rev. Edmund Hogan, S.J.	629, 725
Catholic Church, The, the Patroness of Art. By Rev. J. J. Clancy	823
Chapter, A, towards a Life of the late Rev. Joseph Mullooly, O.P. By C. G. Doran	1108
Churches in the East. By Rev. J. L. Lynch, O.S.F.	617, 735
Conversion of England, The. By Rev. Joseph Tynan, D.D.	642
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Fast Days	81
History of the Ceremonial of Holy Mass	857
Lehmkuhl's "Theologia Moralis," Appendix to	180
Life of John MacHale. By Right Rev. Bernard O'Reilly (A Protest)	284
Life of John MacHale. By Right Rev. Bernard O'Reilly (A Rejoinder)	368
O'Curry MSS., The	80
Priests and Politics	179
Stowe Missal, The	370
Temperance in Country Parts	82
The Prymer	1049
The text "The just man falls seven times a day"	1136
Dante's Ideal of Church and Empire. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	498
DOCUMENTS :—	
Absolution of Cases and Censures Reserved to the Holy See	860
Association for the Propagation of the Faith. Privileges Granted to Helpers	1052
Blessed Sacrament in Outlying Churches, The Keeping of the Calendar, Universal, Addition to the, of the Feasts of SS. John Damascene, &c.	565 91

DOCUMENTS—*continued.*

Exorcismus in Satanam et Angelos Apostaticos iussu Leonis XIII. P. M. editus	88
Holy Family, Letter of His Holiness Leo XIII., commending Devotion to	181
Holy Family, Form of Consecration to the	183
Holy Family, Indulged Prayer to be said Daily before a Picture of the	183
Holy Oils in the Priest's House, The Keeping of the	565
Leo XIII., Letter of His Holiness, commending Devotion to the Holy Family	181
Leo XIII., Encyclical letter of His Holiness, "De Conditione Opificum"	558, 654, 750
Leo XIII., Letter of His Holiness, on the Tercentenary of St. Aloysius	374
Leo XIII., Letter of His Holiness, regarding the Manifestation of Conscience	463
Leo XIII., Letter of His Holiness, on the Extension and Improvement of the Vatican Observatory	1137
Manifestation of Conscience, Letter of His Holiness Leo XIII. regarding	463
Office of the Sacred Heart, Addition to the 6th Lesson of the Sacred Heart, Second Vespers on the Eve of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, The Colour of the Vestments for the Feast of the St. Aloysius, Letter of His Holiness Leo XIII. on the Tercentenary of	91
Sanctuaries of the Holy Land, Annual Collection for the Protection of the	949
Should a Priest at the Altar genuflect during the Elevation at another Altar?	949
Simplified Double concurring with Privileged Sunday—The Order of Commemorations	374
Stations of the Cross, Erection of the	377
Zuchetto at a Ceremony, The Use of the	950
Every-day Life of a Country Parish Priest in Germany, The. By Rev. P. B. Scannell	949
From Forest to Field. By Rev. H. W. Cleary	184
Goethe, The Spirit and Influence of. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	564
History of the Catholic Church in Ireland. By Rev. B. MacCarthy, D.D.	43
History of the Ceremonial of Holy Mass. By Rev. R. O. Kennedy	594, 710
Humouring the Vatican in the Sixteenth Century. By Rev. Joseph Tynan, D.D.	1011
Illustrations of the Passion from Literature and the Drama. By Orby Shipley, M.A.	899
Iphigenia, The Sacrifice of. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	1070

Contents.

V

PAGE

Ireland, History of the Catholic Church in. By Rev. B. MacCarthy, D.D.	43
Irish Abbey at Ypres, The. By E. W. Beck, Esq.	108, 405, 810
Irish Church, Professor Stokes on the Early. By Rev. J. Murphy, c.c.	318
Irish Language, Why and How the, is to be Preserved. By J. McNeill	1099
Irish Parliaments. By Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, M.R.I.A.	116, 212
Leakage from the Catholic Church in Great Britain, The. By Rev. John Curry, P.P.	914
Leo XIII. and the Social Problem. By A. Hinsley, B.A.	961, 1086
Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman. By Cecil Clayton	577, 693
LITURGICAL QUESTIONS:—	
Blessed Sacrament, The Votive Office of the	174
Candles on the Altar, Order of Lighting and Extinguishing the	1134
Chasubles, folded, The use of	554
Confraternities, Various, and Conditions to be Observed in Erecting them	67
Consecratione Ecclesiæ cum Altari, De	849
Convent Chapels, What Mass is to be said in	556
Days, The, on which Solemn Requiem Mass "Praesente Cadavere" is forbidden	1134
Divine Office, Intentions for the. The Pope's Debt	77
Dolour Beads	366
Ecclesiastical Calendar, The	1033, 1128
Holy Week, during the "Triduum" of The Blessed Sacrament in Convent Chapels	1046
Hymns in the Vernacular during Mass	367
"Laus Tibi Christi," Should the, be Sung by the Choir in a Solemn Mass	1134
Mass. May the Choir Sing during the Consecration?	177
Mass, Questions regarding the Prayers to be said after	170
Mass, Requiem, The first Prayer in a	362
Mass, Requiem, within the Octave of All Saints	176
Passion, Should the, be Sung by Deacons?	554
Plenary Indulgence, The Use of a Form for imparting a	1046
Prayer, The, to be said in Blessing the Grave	1134
"Quarant' Ore," The, or Forty Hours' Adoration'	933
Scapular, The Brown, Questions regarding	177
Living Rosary in Detail, The. By Rev. T. M. Byrne, O.P.	134, 261, 333
Living Rosary in Missionary Countries, The. By Rev. D. O'Loan	269
Lough Derg Pilgrimage, The. By Very Rev. J. Fahey, P.P., V.G.	973
"Madonna," The, in the National Gallery. By Rev. A. Dooley	58
Mass, History of the Ceremonial of Holy. By Rev. R. O. Kennedy	594
Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary. By Rev. John Nolan, c.c.	776
Mullooly, Rev. Joseph, O.P., the late, A Chapter towards a Life of. By C. G. Doran	1108

	PAGE
Musical Temperament. By Rev. F. Lennon	224
Newman, John Henry, Letters and Correspondence of. By Cecil Clayton	577, 693

NOTICES OF BOOKS:—

Abridged Bible History—The Child's Bible History,	1144 ;
A Christian Apology,	466, 763 ;
A Reminiscence of the Passion Play at Ober-Ammergau in 1890,	570 ;
A String of Pearls,	192 ;
Aids to Correct and Effective Elocution, with Selected Readings and Recitations,	382 ;
An Introduction to the Study of the Irish Language,	568 ;
Archaeologiae Biblicae Compendium,	864 ;
Art of Profiting by our Faults,	479 ;
Ascetical Works of St. Alphonsus,	558 ;
Birthday Book of the Sacred Heart,	575 ;
Blessed Sacrament and the Church of St. Martin at Liège, 'The,	571 ;
Book of the Professed,	479 ;
Cardinal Newman's Works,	958 ;
Cassell's New German Dictionary,	190 ;
Catholic Young of the Present Day,	480 ;
Catholic Truth Society's Publications,	1144 ;
Considerationes pro Reformatione Vitae in usum Sacerdotum,	576 ;
Crown of Thorns, or the Little Breviary of the Holy Face,	480 ;
Cursus Vitae Spiritualis,	477 ;
De Cisterciensium Hibernorum viris Illustribus,	759 ;
De Insignibus Episcoporum Commentaria,	478 ;
Explanatio Critica Editionis Breviarii Romani quae, a Sacra Congregatione uti Typica Declarata est,	863 ;
Ecclesiastical History of Newfoundland,	470 ;
Eucharistic Jewels,	192 ;
Fate of the Children of Tuireann,	475 ;
First Communicant's Manual,	479 ;
German Dictionary, Cassell's New,	190 ;
Golden Sands,	479 ;
Harp of Jesus, a Prayer-book in Verse,	384 ;
History of the Sufferings of Eighteen Carthusians in England,	379 ;
Holy Cross Abbey, and the Cistercian Order in Ireland,	576 ;
Holy Face of Jesus,	575 ;
Holy Lives: 1 The Leper Queen; The Blessed Ones of 1888,	191 ;
How to Get On,	766 ;
Idols, or the Secret of the Rue Chausse d'Antin,	188 ;
Is. One Religion as Good as Another? 575 ;	575 ;
John MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam: his Life, Times and Correspondence,	93 ;
Life and Labours of St. Thomas of Aquin,	571 ;
Life and Scenery in Missouri,	764 ;
Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More,	668 ;
Life of Father John Curtis, of the Society of Jesus,	761 ;
Life of Blessed John Fisher,	668 ;
Life of St. Aloysius Gonzaga,	768 ;
Life of St. Aloysius Gonzaga, S.J.,	762 ;
Life of St. John the Baptist,	573 ;
Life of St. Thomas Aquinas,	571 ;
Little Gems from Thomas à Kempis,	479 ;
Little Nell: a Sketch,	384 ;
Mary in the Epistles; or the Implicit Teaching of the Apostles concerning the Blessed Virgin, contained in their Writings,	476 ;
Maxims of St. Philip Neri,	479 ;
Mdlle. Louise de Marillac,	864 ;
Ministry of the Word,	566 ;
On the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass,	191 ;
One and Thirty Days with Blessed Margaret Mary,	96 ;
Our Lady's Garden of Roses,	1143 ;
Perfection of Man by Charity,	382 ;
Philosophy of	

NOTICES OF BOOKS—*continued.*

the Mazdayasnian Religion under the Sassanids, 471; Preces ante et post Missam, 862; Plain Sermons on the Fundamental Truths of the Catholic Church, 472; Poet's Purgatory, The, and Other Poems, 671; Poems of the Past, <i>ib.</i> ; Poems and Ballads of Young Ireland, <i>ib.</i> ; Pontificale Romanum Summorum Pontificum Jussu Editum a Benedicto XIV. et Leone XIII. Pont. Max Recognitum et Castigatum, 862; Principles of Anthropology and Biology, 286; Rational Religion, 190; Revelations of the Sacred Heart to Blessed Margaret Mary, 287; Rights of Our Little Ones, or First Principles on Education, 480; Rituale Romanum, 478; Roman Missal, The, and Supplement Adapted to the Use of the Laity, 1143; Short Instruction in the Art of Singing Plain-Chant, 1141; St. Anastasia, Virgin and Martyr, 381; St. Basil's Hymn Book, St. Basil's Hymnal, 96; St. Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits, 952; Scott's "Rokeby," 960; Selected Sermons, 570; Special Devotion to the Holy Ghost, 670; Sermon delivered on the Occasion of the Consecration of Maynooth College Church, 960; Sermons for Sundays and Festivals, 1056; Short Sermons on the Gospels, 288; Summa Apologetica De Ecclesia Catholica ad Mentem and Thomae Aquinatis, 469; The Blind Apostle and Heroine of Charity, 767; The Christian Virgin, in her Family and in the World: her Virtues and her Mission at the present time, 764; The Garden of Divine Love, 191; Theologia Moralis (Editio Sexta), 478; Theologia Moralis per Modum Conferentiarum, 186; Theologia Moralis per Modum Conferentiarum, 762; Thesaurus Sacerdotum, 478; The Seven Dolours, 191; The Sodality Manual, <i>ib.</i> ; Tractatus de Actibus Humanis, 959; Triumphalia Chronologica Monasterii Sanctae Crucis in Hibernia, 759; The Ven. Jean Baptiste Vianney, Cure d'Ars, 765; Twelve Virtues of a Good Teacher, 480; Two Spiritual Retreats for Sisters, 1056; Valentine Riant, 669; Venerable Sir Adrian Fortescue, The Martyr, 383; Virgin Mother of Good Counsel, 479; Visible and Invisible Worlds, 669; Whither Goest Thou? or, Was Father Mathew Right? 1053.	
Office of Reason in Theology, The. By Rev. W. H. Kent, o.s.c.	385
Origin of Plain-Chant, The. By Rev. F. E. Gilliat Smith	607
Oxford Movement, The. Twelve Years, 1833-1845. By Evelyn Mordaunt	984
Philosophy, Aristotle and Catholic. By Rev. T. E. Judge	442
Priests and Politics. By Rev. J. S. Vaughan (See also Correspondence)	29
Professor Stokes on the Early Irish Church. By Rev. J. Murphy, c.c.	318
Renan and the Kings of Israel. By Rev. J. A. Howlett, o.s.b.	193
St. Aidan, or Maidoc, Bishop of Ferns. By Rev. J. A. Howlett, o.s.b.	673
St. Patrick, Thoughts about: St. Patrick and St. Paul. By Rev. James Halpin	413
Sen (Old) Patrick, Who Was He? By Rev. Sylvester Malone, M.R.I.A.	800

	PAGE
Some Causes of Anglican Secession. By Orby Shipley, M.A.	481
Some Recollections of Fr. Peter Kenney, S.J. By the late Very Rev. P. Murray, D.D.	794
Sources of Theology, The. By Rev. W. H. Kent, O.S.C.	1
Stowe Missal, The. By Most Rev. Dr. Healy	97
Study of the Human Mind, The. By Rev. J. Coyle	49
Temperance Movement, The Catholic. By Rev. M. Kelly, M.S.S.	15, 158, 242
The Blessed Edmund Campion's "History of Ireland" and its Critics. By Rev. Edmund Hogan, S.J.	529, 725
The Catholic Church, The Patroness of Art. By Rev. J. J. Clancy	823
The Privilege of Adrian IV. to Henry II. By Rev. Sylvester Malone, M.R.I.A.	865
THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS —	
Excommunication	352
Fasting, Questions about	282
Honoraria for Second Mass	359
Marriage Question, A	75, 338, 352, 451
Mass, Honoraria for Second	359
May a Priest who asks another to say Mass, for which a Honorarium was given, retain for himself a part of the Honorarium?	1029
Promise of Marriage	352
Quasi-domicile	355
Retired Priests, Jurisdiction of	352
Temperance Pledge	352
Theology, The Sources of. By Rev. W. H. Kent, O.S.C.	1
Thoughts on the Nature of God. By Rev. J. S. Vaughan	308
Thoughts on the Wisdom of God. By Rev. J. S. Vaughan	815
Ulick De Burgo, First Earl of Clanricarde. By Very Rev. J. A. Fahey, V.G.	525
Universal Expectation of the Virgin and the Messias. By Rev. Philip Duffy, C.C.	769
Walter Scott's Journal. By Cecil Clayton	423
What Do the Irish Sing? By Very Rev. A. Canon Ryan	717
When England was "Merrie" England. By Rev. J. S. Vaughan	513
Windthorst, Dr.: his Life and Work. By Rev. M. O'Riordan	535

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JULY, 1891.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN
HENRY NEWMAN, DURING HIS LIFE IN THE
ENGLISH CHURCH.¹

ALTHOUGH we have already heard, not only from both friend and foe, but also from his own pen, much concerning Cardinal Newman and his life, we venture to say that to few of our readers have these topics yet become wearisome; and we believe that these two volumes of letters, written whilst he was still an Anglican, will be welcome reading to our co-religionists. To some of the letters, no doubt, it may be objected that they are of mere local or ephemeral interest. Still, even here it would be difficult to decide which letters to omit. Many of no apparent importance, and which detract from the continuous flow of events, and distract the mind from the main incidents of Newman's life, may yet throw a side light on an obscure incident or an action which has been misunderstood; and for every word or line which enables us more fully to understand one who was, perhaps, the most fascinating and attractive personality of the age, we feel grateful. Independently of his writings, of his preaching, and of his high position in the Church, Newman, as an individual, has attracted, has puzzled, even has repelled, more than one generation of his fellow-countrymen; and the more intimately we become acquainted with him as a man,

¹ Edited by Anne Mozley. 2 Vols. London: Longmans. 1891.

the better can we understand how it comes to pass that, whilst viewed differently by different classes of men, and at different periods of time, nevertheless to all he has been an object of interest or of curiosity.

We have already been allowed to study, with all the light he himself could throw on the question, the commencement, the development, and at length the fulfilment of the early feelings and experiences which caused the great change which in middle life took place in Newman's position. To that change it is owing that we are able to claim as our own, England's most powerful religious thinker, and one whose whole person commands so much respect, that his very presence amongst us was sufficient, with many minds, to dispel the unreasonable prejudice with which the Catholic Church was in past times regarded. The *Apologia*, however, was concerned entirely with "the history of my religious opinions;" and although it may be difficult, in this case, to disassociate the man from his opinions—so thoroughly was Newman's religion a part of and one with himself—still we learn much from these letters that is new, and therefore gladly welcome them as giving us a clearer knowledge of Cardinal Newman from his boyhood to the year 1845, the date when the Anglican Communion suffered the severest of the many losses it has had to deplore, and the Church added a devoted servant to her ranks.

From the opening chapter we learn Cardinal Newman's opinion that a more thorough knowledge of a man was to be obtained by the study of his letters than from any other source. "Biographers varnish, they assign motives, they conjecture feelings, they interpret Lord Burleigh's nods; but contemporary letters are facts," he tells us. With the exception of a short autobiographical sketch, which, beginning with his birth, carries us no further than 1832, these volumes are entirely composed of letters, and the short editorial links which are necessary to make them intelligible to the reader. The editor is fortunate in having from Cardinal Newman's own pen a certain law by which to select amongst his letters. Many years ago, when writing to a friend on the subject of the letters in Hurrell Froude's *Remains*, he tells us that,

although many may be criticised as being out of place, and for other reasons, yet on the whole they present "a picture of a mind." By this aim—viz., to bring Cardinal Newman before us as a whole—the editor, whilst using the letters as a record of a busy life, has desired to be guided. We, therefore, have a picture of Newman in every relation—as a son and a brother, as a friend and acquaintance, as a pupil and as a tutor; in many phases of character, in his temperament, in his impetuosity, in his tenderness—in fact, in all that constitutes his distinct and marked individuality.

That Cardinal Newman was far from indifferent to the history of his life, which was to take the place of a regular biography, is manifest from the care with which he selected both the letters which were to be published and the editor to whose care they were to be confided. Nothing seems to have been left to chance. In 1884, the papers were placed in Miss Mozley's hands, and, after a suitable choice had been made, they were returned to Cardinal Newman three years later. Although since that time other and important additions have been placed at the editor's disposal, yet these also had the cardinal's approval as forming part of the history of his life. We may, therefore, conclude that in these volumes we possess the letters which he himself considered characteristic of the writer, and which gave an authentic and trustworthy view of the stirring times in which he lived, and of the events which he played so great a part in producing.

That the history of his earlier years should be compiled and annotated by a Protestant, was Newman's not unnatural desire. His main object was, that a trustworthy history of the movement with which in early life he was connected, should be given to the world; and this, with the sincerest wish to do his best, we may safely assert, no born Catholic would have been able to compile. We believe no Catholic could place himself in imagination in the position of the Tractarian leaders, nor could one easily be found who would be able to sympathise with their vain effort to Catholicise the Establishment, or with the hope that by the mere and arbitrary charge of individual teaching, the Protestant religion of England could be converted into an integral

part of the Catholic Church. History written in an unsympathetic spirit, is rarely vivid history; nor, we may add, although all conscious misrepresentation be avoided, can it be a strictly truthful one. Essential truthfulness is of so subtle a nature that the slightest failure in grasping the true meaning of a position or the accuracy of a view, the slight misunderstanding of a word or a phrase, may produce so complete a misrepresentation, that absolute mis-statement could do no worse. That a Catholic should be able clearly to distinguish between what, in the phraseology of those days, was respectively styled "Catholic" and "Roman;" that he should be able to place himself in the position of those who, whilst wishing to be Catholic, yet "abominated" Rome, the Pope, and all his works, is well-nigh impossible. No doubt the ideal editor of Newman's letters would have been one who, whilst sharing his early errors, shared also his later awakening to the truth. But, as Miss Mozley truly observes, Newman outlived nearly all his contemporaries, and we have now to pay the penalty of having been allowed to keep him so long with us, by having to-day no one amongst his co-religionists, who whilst realizing the futility of Newman's early hopes, yet once himself was enslaved with the like.

In the volumes before us, Newman's Anglican life divides itself naturally into two portions, of very unequal length, so far as years are concerned, though the interest of the twelve years the record of which fills the second volume, may be said to surpass all that is contained in the thirty-two years which preceded them. In the first volume we have the story of his school and university life—this last both as an undergraduate and as a tutor and fellow of Oriel College—together with a graphic account of his travels in Italy, Greece, and Sicily, and of the fever which prostrated him in this last-named island. From his recovery from this illness he dates the start of a new life. On his return to England the Tractarian movement commences, and the second volume is concerned mainly with this phase of Oxford thought. At first the letters are joyous and triumphant in character. Then they sober into more critical tone, and

the disapproval he meets with in high quarters leavens all with distrust. Then, later on, follow sadness, anxiety, and anguish of mind, as he slowly realizes that he has been weaving ropes out of sand, and that his ideal of Catholicising the English Church has but landed him in the necessity of leaving her communion. With his reception into the Catholic Church, the present editor's task concludes.

Before placing Newman's autobiographical memoir before us, the editor has printed a few extracts from his writings, which, as they are probably the remembrances of his own early experiences, enable us to gather some idea of Newman's mind and feelings in childhood. From his first years he seems to have exhibited many of the characteristics with which in his after-life we are familiar. Thus, although in later years thoroughly chastened by self-control, it is not difficult to recognise the strong character of the man in the wilful child, who, in answer to his mother's remark after an infantine struggle for mastery, "You see, John, you did not get your way." "No," he answered, "but I tried very hard." Again, the sensitiveness which throughout his long life never left him, is discernable in the forlorn child of seven, who, when left at school by his parents, was found crying by his master. To cheer him up he suggested that he should join his school-fellows. To this he objected—his tears having no doubt been observed, and excited derision—"O sir, they will say such things! I can't help crying." On his master making light of it, "O sir, but they will, they will say all sorts of things:" and, taking his master's hand, "come and see for yourself," John led him into the crowded room, where, of course, under the circumstances, there was no teasing.

To his sensitiveness, which by some persons has been considered excessive, we should be disposed to attribute part of Newman's influence. It surrounded him, so to say, with feelers, which, whilst acutely influenced by all that approached him, put him in touch with the feelings of others, and enabled him to sympathise with their joys and sorrows, and to realize both with an accuracy which is rare. An affectionate man, and one who is keenly alive to every

gradation of feeling, both in himself and others—and this a sensitive vision will give—is sure to be a deeply sympathetic man. The very pain he himself experiences at coldness or disapproval will sound a note of warning, and enable him to deal with others otherwise than he himself has been dealt with. Such sensitiveness is like a sixth sense, a moral and mental sense of touch. To all, and more especially to the young, few qualities are more appealing than sympathy; and this, joined to his great intellectual gifts, his power of humour, his thorough truthfulness of nature and hatred of all unreality, created the personality which drew after him with such deep affection the hearts of his followers. Not that Newman objected to criticism. So long as it was unaccompanied by misunderstanding, he both courted and accepted it, and from many of these letters we see friendly criticism freely ventured on, and taken as a matter of course. He did, however, find it hard to be misunderstood; and on the delicate ground which he occupied during the last years of his Anglican ministry, misunderstanding was inevitable. Yet, when he suffered most from its chilling influence, he seems ever to have felt confident that, with fuller knowledge, his fellow-countrymen would do him justice—an anticipation which, it is consolatory to remember, even in his lifetime, was realized. The writing of the *Apologia* may have been a trying effort, but it quickly brought its reward, and since 1864, we venture to say, Newman has stood fairly with all honest Englishmen.

The scene at school which has led us into a digression on a marked characteristic of Newman's, took place at Ealing, at Dr. Nicholas' school, where he remained over eight years, and which he only left for the University.

Even at school, Newman already was addicted to literary composition, and tells us that he took much pains with his style. To writing and to books he devoted most of his play-time, and was rarely to be seen taking part in any game. From an early age he seems to have inspired his parents and all with whom he came in contact with confidence and even with respect; and these feelings deepened as years advanced. Thus later on, when, though still a very young

man, he was established at Oriel, his family chanced to be suffering from a period of anxiety which he also shared, his mother writes that throughout she had felt sure all would end well, and that she always began and ended every conversation with his father on the matter by saying: "I have no fear; John will manage." But, although all his tastes were innocent and his behaviour decorous, at the earlier time of which we write, there is nothing to show that in his boyhood Newman was particularly religious. Indeed, he seems hardly to have wished to be so. He writes: "I recollect, in 1815, I believe, thinking that I should like to be virtuous, but not religious. There was something in the latter idea I did not like." The great change, which he calls his "conversion," came about when he was fifteen, though we hear little of its cause or the immediate events which brought it about. The banking-house with which his father was connected stopped payment in 1816, and, as one result he remained at Dr. Nicholas' school for six months longer than had been intended. Of this change he writes:—"On my conversion, how the wisdom and goodness of God is discerned! I was going from school half a year sooner than I did. My staying arose from the 8th of March. Thereby I was left at school by myself, my friends gone away." Of the reality of this event and of its effects, his estimate through life remains unaltered. In 1864, in the *Apologia*, he writes: "Of the inward change of which I speak, I am still more certain than that I have hands and feet;" and again he testifies even more strongly in advanced old age:—"Of course, I cannot myself be the judge of myself; but, speaking with this reserve, I should say that it is difficult to realize or imagine the identity of the boy before and after August, 1816. . . I can look back at the end of seventy years as if on another person." From this date his mind seems to have been engrossed with the subjects that filled his after-life. Theology occupied his mind, and such cognate subjects as the appeal to conscience, searchings of heart and motives, and all that is nearly allied to our relations with God and the unseen world, in conduct, in intellect, and in will, became his absorbing and pervading interests.

As an example of the often apparently accidental nature of many of the most eventful issues in our lives, Newman relates that even at the last moment, when the post-chaise was at the door, his father was undecided as to whether he should order the horses' heads to be turned in the direction of Oxford or of Cambridge. Had the decision been otherwise, how different might not have been the results! On reaching Oxford, Mr. Newman had hoped to place his son at Exeter College; but finding no vacancy there, Newman matriculated at Trinity, and shortly afterwards came into residence. From his earlier letters, he seems to have felt the University a somewhat uncongenial home. He had come to Oxford hoping to find a great seat of learning; and yet, at first, assistance in learning seems not to have been easily obtained. Even in so simple a matter as being directed in his reading for the vacation, he found difficulties. On his applying to the president of his college for help, he was told that such matters were left to the tutors. On turning to the tutors, in the first instance, he obtained no help, only a recommendation elsewhere to some one who might assist him. He persevered, however, and was at length rewarded by the information he wanted. To an outsider, it would appear that, in such a matter, no youth ought to have been left to take the initiative, and that, far from having to seek direction, it ought to have been offered spontaneously. Nor were Newman's earlier experiences amongst his fellow-undergraduates much happier. Neither their wine parties nor their conversation were much after his taste. An acquaintance asked him to his rooms on one occasion, to take a glass of wine with a few others, and he writes:—"And they drank and drank all the time I was there. I was very glad that prayers came half an hour after I came to them, for I am sure I was not entertained with either their drinking or their conversation." One friend, however, he made in the earlier days of his residence at Trinity, and with him acquaintance deepened into a warm and lasting friendship. This was Mr. Bowden, who for the rest of his life—he died prematurely in 1844—was a constant correspondent and associate of Newman's. He himself never

became a Catholic—perhaps owing to the early date of his death, before Newman's own conversion; yet, as the Church during the last forty years, and still to-day, is indebted to his family for more than one highly-valued priest, this early friendship is worth recording. Had it never existed, the Church might not have numbered them amongst her children.

Mr. Bowden is the only undergraduate friend of whom we hear, and Newman's life was a very lonely one. He seems to have lived in his rooms, as he expresses it, like a hermit. Even so eventful a public incident as the death of Princess Charlotte only became known to him from a question of his tailor as to his requiring mourning. As we might expect, Newman studied hard, and he quickly secured a scholarship on the foundation of his own college. This was, however, the only university distinction which he gained during his career as an undergraduate. In spite of his assiduous and excessive reading—indeed, perhaps in consequence of its very excess—he broke down completely in his final examinations, and instead of taking the highest honours for which he had worked hard and had sanguine expectations of obtaining, his name only appeared in the lower division of the second class of classical honours. This unlooked-for failure was probably as much the result of physical as of mental causes. Newman was considerably younger than the ordinary age for taking a degree; he had over-read himself; and, being called up sooner than he expected, simply lost his head. He experienced a similar attack after a severe course of reading some years later, when he himself was an examiner. It obliged him to leave Oxford, and for a while to relinquish his office.

Newman's disappointment in the schools had an important effect on his life. His father had destined him for the bar, and had already entered his name at Lincoln's Inn. The failure to obtain high honours induced the father to consent to his son's change of a profession, and in 1821 Newman decided on taking Anglican orders. Some years would still elapse before his ordination; but he had his fellowship at Trinity, and could continue to reside at Oxford and take

pupils. He soon after, however, was able to obtain a permanent status in the university. An opportunity occurring, he decided on standing for a fellowship at Oriel College. This was an ambitious—he himself calls it an audacious—attempt for one who so far had little academical success of which to boast—a fellowship at Oriel being the object of ambition of all rising men at Oxford. He, himself, however, had never gauged his intellectual merits by his failure in the schools; he knew how accidental had been its cause, and did not now despair. As it is well-known, he succeeded, and thus found himself at an unusually early age occupying a high position in Oxford.

Newman ever felt the 12th April, 1822, the date of his election—to have been the turning-point in his life, and to the end remembered the day with thankfulness. A fellowship at Oriel gave him at once a competency and a status, and enabled him to join in the higher intellectual society of Oxford as an equal. It opened out for him a theological career, by bringing him into contact with the various schools of thought, whereby the religious sentiments which were now habitual to him were further developed and enlarged. He, himself, tells us that, in these days, he never wished for anything better or higher than “to live and die a fellow of Oriel.” Little did he foresee that he would live a religious and die a Cardinal of the Catholic Church.

In Newman's earlier days at Oriel, Whately, afterwards Protestant archbishop of Dublin, was the man who obtained the greatest influence with him. It appears that the older fellows at Oriel found their latest member somewhat difficult to get on with. Newman's extreme shyness stood in the way of easy intercourse, and increased the natural diffidence which he felt at finding himself at the age of one-and-twenty placed in a position of equality with men whom he so deeply revered. They, therefore, induced Whately to take him in hand and to break through his reserve, a task for which he was well adapted. He was a great talker, and his conversation was both lively and forcible, and well calculated to put a young man at his ease. Newman soon felt great affection for and gratitude to Whately, who,

on his side, shortly after their acquaintance began, complimented him on being the clearest-headed man he knew. For four years Newman was strongly influenced by Whately in theological questions, and his intimacy with him during this period was considerable. At the end of that time other influences came into play, and gradually, as their views diverged more and more, an alienation arose between the two, till in 1854 when Newman, then a Catholic priest, was in Dublin, and proposed calling on Archbishop Whately, it was intimated to him that his visit would not be acceptable. Newman himself, indeed, writes in 1833:—"As to poor Whately, it is melancholy. Of course, to know him now is impossible." So hot was the zeal of the young tractarian, to whom the idea of the importance of an orthodox faith came with the force of novelty! When once within the Church we see it mellowed so far as to allow himself to propose a visit to Whately, one of the many examples of the larger charity of Catholics in dealing with those of another communion, compared with that of Anglicans, in their intercourse with one another.

In 1824 Newman was ordained deacon, and took a curacy at St. Clement's in Oxford. This was an old church which required re-building, and the incumbent being aged, the energy of a younger man was required to collect funds for this purpose. Here Newman worked steadily for the next two years, remodelled the services, and was active in his parochial duties. He also succeeded in raising the £5,000 or £6,000 necessary for the new church, in which, however, he never ministered, as he relinquished his curacy on being appointed public tutor of his college in 1826.

Slowly but surely during these years a great change was coming over Newman's religious opinions. Since his "conversion" when fifteen, his views had been strictly Evangelical; but by degrees, partly in consequence of the atmosphere of the common room at Oriel, partly through his friendship with Pusey, Hawkins, and Hurrell Froude, these were changed. To Pusey, who was near his own age, he became greatly attached. At first, in writing of him, he uses the somewhat patronising phraseology which is not unusual with

Evangelicals when speaking of those outside their own narrow party. He hopes "he is Thine, O Lord," yet fears "he is greatly prejudiced against God's children," and then prays that "he may be brought into the true Church." Soon, however, his tone changes into genuine admiration, and a hope that he may have grace to imitate Pusey's humility, gentleness, and love. Hawkins was considerably Newman's senior. His views were similar to Pusey's, and chance throwing him much in contact at this time with Newman, his opinions were not without their influence. More strong than all, however, was the effect of his intercourse with Hurrell Froude, who became one of his greatest, if not his very dearest friend from 1826, when he was elected Fellow of Oriel. Of him he writes:—"He is one of the acutest and clearest and deepest men in the memory of man." They soon became extremely intimate, visited each other's families; and when, latter on, Froude's health required that he should winter in the south of Europe, Newman accompanied him and his father in the journey.

Two severe domestic sorrows befell Newman during the years of which we write. In 1824 he lost his father, to whom he was deeply attached, and still more bitter grief was the death of his bright young sister, Mary, in 1827. For her Newman seems to have felt a special affection, and nowhere else is the veil more lifted from his most intimate feelings, and on no other occasion are we allowed to sound their deep tenderness so fully as when he is writing of her loss. One of her letters to her brother, written shortly before her very sudden death, is given in these volumes—a happy mixture of respect, admiration, affection, and playfulness, from which we can well picture an engaging and charming girl. Her death is the subject of the touching poem headed, "Consolations in Bereavement;" and through life her image seems never to have faded from his vision. On his return to Oxford, after her death, he writes to another sister begging her carefully to note down all that she can remember about Mary; "her general character, and all the delightful things we can now recollect concerning her. Alas! memory does not remain vivid, and we shall else

forget it." In his solitary rides, whilst enjoying the first May beauty of the country, he writes: "Mary seems embodied in every tree, and hid behind every hill;" and, again, in November, he tells us he has learnt to find a special beauty in trees and swamps and fogs: "a solemn voice seems to chant from everywhere; I know whose voice it is—her dear voice. Her form is almost nightly before me, when I have put out the light and lain down." Newman's deep affection for his family is apparent throughout his letters, and both his father and his mother's death touched him nearly; but, in neither case does his grief so overwhelm him as at the premature death of his sweet Mary.

As years went by, and Newman was fully engaged in the work of a tutor at Oriel, a certain difference in opinion arose between him and Hawkins, who by this time was Provost of Oriel. Space forbids our entering into its details. Suffice it to say, it arose from a divergence in the view which Newman took of his relation to his pupils (he considering it of a very intimate and even spiritual nature) to that taken by the provost, who considered it merely an educational arrangement. Although this did not affect their united action all at once, the difference was sufficiently grave to make compromise impossible, and it ended by the provost practically depriving Newman of his office, by refusing to put any more pupils under his care. He continued to instruct those already entrusted to him, but by the vacation of 1832 they had taken their degree, and his tutorship was at an end.

Driven from ordinary work, and yet tied to Oxford by his position of vicar of Mary's (he had succeeded to this benefice), Newman on his return home took to work of another nature, and commenced issuing the eventful "Tracts for the Times." Humanly speaking, these would never have been commenced had he not been deprived of his tutorship; and of their importance to Newman and to the body to which he then belonged, it is unnecessary to speak. With the tracts began the change in the Established Religion which enables Anglicans not untruly to speak of our Catholic cardinal as the founder of the English Church as to-day we see it.

As we stated above, it was with Hurrell Froude and his father that Newman made his first experiences of foreign travel, and his letters home, mainly to his family, give a vivid account of his journeyings. His enjoyment of fresh scenes is extreme, and his description of his early days at sea, when he coasted down the western side of Europe, gives us a bright picture of sea and land, seen through the clear medium of a southern atmosphere, which enhances the beauty of both. They sailed to Gibraltar, from thence to Malta and the Greek islands, then back to Naples, and so to Rome.

It is gratifying to find that from the first Newman is able thoroughly to appreciate Rome. On the morning after his arrival he writes that it is the first city he has been able to admire—that, like Aaron's rod, it swallowed up all the admiration which in other cases is distributed among Naples, Valetta, and other towns. It is constantly described in his letters as a wonderful place. Once, when detailing the mingled feelings which at that date it aroused in him, feelings of reverence for the place of martyrdom and burial of the Apostles, and for the city to which England owes the blessing of the Gospel, but degraded to-day, as he thought, by superstitions introduced as essential parts of Christianity—he calls it “a cruel place.” In the remains of pagan Rome he sees specimens of the exertions of our great enemy against heaven: “The Coliseum is quite a tower of Babel.” From early prejudices—it can have been from no other cause, for so far he had never been brought in contact with Catholicism—he cannot divest himself of the idea that even Christian Rome is under a special shade, though he is obliged to own that her clergy are correct and decorous, and that Sunday is well observed. Evidently he sees nothing to confirm his idea, and for this reason, perhaps, he writes to his mother:—“As to the Roman Catholic system, I have ever detested it so much that I cannot detest it more by seeing it.” Finding nothing in Rome to change unreasoning aversion into thoughtful disapproval, he falls back on early prejudices as a means of reassuring his mother. He seems, in fact, to have regarded the ecclesiastical system of

Rome from the simple point of view of the ordinary English tourist, and dogmatizes as to the amount of fasting in practice amongst the Roman clergy, with an assumption of knowledge to which, in later days, he affixed the words, "this is nonsense."

However, as Hawthorn, a man of a very different stamp of genius, has well described, after a first visit, perhaps the full charm of Rome is only felt by a Protestant when he has turned his back on the Eternal City. When Newman returns to Naples his tone is changed. "How shall I describe the sadness with which I left the tomb of the Apostles!" he writes almost in Catholic words; "Rome has a part of my heart; and, in going away from it, I am as it were tearing it in twain." "Oh that Rome were not Rome," he exclaims in another place. We already hear the first note of his despairing poem, "Oh! that thy creed were sound," and his heart and his affections and his sympathies are already stirring in the direction whither he himself is destined to move. In Rome Newman parted from the Froudes, and proceeded alone to Sicily. Here, as is well known, he was prostrated by serious illness and fever which delayed his return to England for a considerable time.

Of Newman's interest in his own sensations and experiences we have a striking example in the vivid account of his illness which he wrote some years afterwards; it is sufficiently characteristic to deserve notice, especially as he ever looked on this fever as a turning-point in his life. Throughout its course, although conscious that those around him thought differently, he always felt sure he should recover. As he sat on his bed, weakened and prostrated by the fever, he reiterated that he should not die, as God had work for him in England; and his recovery he took as a special grace from God, which obliged him to consecrate his life still more emphatically to His undivided service. In one passage of deep interest Newman details his feelings, which are evidently made acutely active by the fever working in his blood. The very fact, however, of their vividness allows of their being put into words with a definiteness which else

might have eluded him. The sensation of hollowness which great souls will sometimes experience both in themselves and in all around them oppressed him greatly. He seems to have viewed himself as not really imbued with high truth and great principles, but as merely an intellectual medium through which they could be presented to others: "as a pane of glass which transmits heat, being cold itself." Keble, he thinks, states to him his convictions, and these Newman's intellectual capacity enables him to draw out, and to present to the world with rhetorical and histrionic power. Indeed, that he takes hold of truths as he might sing a pleasing tune, but as things outside himself, "loving the truth, but not possessing it; at heart hollow, with little love and little self-denial." Yet throughout he often repeats the words, "I have not sinned against light." Then he describes all the incidents of his fever—his faintings and weakness, his wilfulness, and yet his submissiveness to his servant. After these follow the joys of convalescence. From the village where he had been stricken down he travelled to Palermo as soon as he could move. Even to an ordinary traveller the beauty of the month of May in such a country is well-nigh intoxicating. The spring luxuriance was around him and on every side, the vines and fig-trees in their fresh green robes, the scent of orange-trees in full flower, the carpet of flowers below, the distant snow-topped mountains forming a fitting background to the bright and beautiful scene—"all was in tune with my reviving life." Even from his returning appetite he derives a pleasure beyond the mere gratification of a material sense. His tea and his broth gave him a sensation of ecstatic delight, and he exclaims, "It is life from the dead."

He ends the account of his illness with prophetic words. It was written in 1840, and at that date it must have seemed an event of little importance to any beyond his own immediate friends. Many another English traveller has been struck down with malarious fever, and in all cases the illness runs its course, brings its pains and subsequent pleasure with it. Why, in Newman's case, should it need recording? He says: "The thought keeps pressing on me

while I write this, what am I writing it for?" and then he adds, " Shall I ever have spiritual children who will take an interest?"

This question carries us over a long span of time since 1840; and half a century later, we can give it no unhesitating answer. We seem to see a multitude of men and women past numbering, who, perhaps differing widely in all else, yet here agree to take an *interest*. There are men of science who have reason to pause and ponder in their materializing course before the *interest* excited by one great mind—a mind whose simple faith in a spiritual world they cannot view with the contempt they might feel for that of a lesser intellect. Then we see sceptics who are driven to acknowledge that the mere fact of so great a man having bowed before God's revelation, adds to its supposed myths, at any rate, an intelligent *interest*. Again, we have earnest-minded Christians, who by God's inscrutable ways, are permitted whilst loving their Lord to deny all grace and truth to His Church, and who are yet arrested by and *interested* in a body to whose paramount and exclusive claims Newman yielded, and in which, flying from his own home and from his own people, he found rest and peace. And, lastly, amongst his own Communion, who is there who does not take an *interest*? First, in his own cloistered abode, we see a venerable and aged form surrounded by his "spiritual children," and to these every part, act, and word of their great father and friend is of the deepest *interest*. Then beyond, if we look at our churches, convents, and schools, at the beauty of our buildings, the richness of our services, and the devotion of our people, we may remember that much of all we see and admire is due to those on whom the gift of faith was bestowed as a result of the *interest* they took in Newman. They now strive to repay their own great gain by lavishing material splendour and deep devotion on the Church into which he led them; and in this they are nobly seconded by many, who although the faith came to them as their birthright, yet owe a more intelligent and spiritual acceptance of the same to the *interest* which he aroused in them. Thus, when Newman asks: " Shall I ever have in my old age

spiritual children who will take an interest?" we may answer: "Thy children shall be as the sands by the sea . . . and they shall rise up and call thee blessed."

Of the second half of Newman's Anglican life we hope to write on another occasion.

CECIL CLAYTON.

HISTORY OF THE CEREMONIAL OF HOLY MASS.

HOLY Mass, in its essence, was celebrated by our Divine Lord "on the night before He suffered;" but that He wore vestments, such as the priest offering Holy Mass in our days does, or that He said the same prayers (excepting, of course, the sacred words of consecration), or that He used the same gestures according to the rites and rubrics which the celebrant is bound nowadays to follow, seems as foreign to our thoughts, if not more so, than to our ears. The ceremonial of Holy Mass, therefore, has undergone change and development from time to time until it has become what we find it to-day. In the early ages of the Church, no doubt, ceremonial was used in the celebration of Holy Mass; but from records and from tradition it is certain that it was not identical in all points—the one sacred moment of consecration always excepted—with what we see at our altars.

It is quite unnecessary to remark, that change of ceremonial does not imply change of doctrine. The Catholic Church of to-day teaches the very same truth that the Divine Master taught, and in the selfsame words—that the bread by the words of consecration is changed into the body of Christ, and the wine into His precious blood; so that our Divine Lord might stand on the altar, and, looking to the sacred species after consecration, declare, "This is My body, this is My blood."

The Evangelists give us no detail of ceremonial, or very little. They state the fact that this adorable mystery took place. That was all that their duty when writing the holy Gospels demanded of them. It would be very interesting, indeed, to us to take up St. Mathew, for instance, and read there a detailed description of that last evening of the mortal life of our Lord—how it was spent, how He sat, what He said, how He introduced the feast, how it passed over, and what He did after; every look, every word, every action; just as we read, He told them that one should betray Him, and they being very much troubled began to say, “Is it I, Lord?” or, “Peter answering, said to Him, Though all men be scandalized in Thee, I will never be scandalized;” or with the same minuteness of detail that he describes the sacred agony in the Garden.

St. Mark is quite as reticent as St. Mathew.

From St. Luke, who describes with such circumstance of detail the beginning of our Divine Lord's life, we might expect some amplification. But no, the mystery in the upper room is related with much the same brevity. Yet how interesting the few details he does give—“*A man carrying a pitcher of water*” through the streets of the city; “*he will show you a large dining-room furnished;*” and that beautiful saying that in all times has won so many hearts, “*With desire I have desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer.*”

The beloved disciple has, indeed, a great deal about what took place in that “large dining-room;” “*He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the feet of the disciples, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded;*” “*When Jesus had said these things, He was troubled in spirit, and He protested and said, Amen, amen, I say to you, that one of you shall betray Me;*” but of ceremonial, no detail whatever.

Finally, in St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Ep. xi. 23-27) we have again the one adorable fact, but no circumstance of detail.

All the knowledge we obtain from the New Testament with regard to the ceremonial used by our Divine Lord may

be summed up in the one stanza of the beautiful hymn of St. Thomas Aquinas:—

“ In supremæ nocte coenæ,
Recumbens cum fratribus,
Observata lege plene,
Cibis in legalibus,
Cibum turbae duodenæ,
Se dat suis manibus.”

In the *Dolorous Passion* of Sister Catherine Emmerich there is a chapter which, whatever may be thought of the mystical writings of that (seemingly) holy and very mortified nun, will at any rate impress the devout mind in an edifying manner:—

“The table was narrow, and about half a foot higher than the knees of a man. In shape it resembled a horse shoe. . . . The paschal lamb was placed on a dish in the centre of the table . . . They ate in haste,” &c.

“There has always been a tradition in the Church [says Dr. Gasquet¹], as St. Jerome and St. Nazianzen bear witness, that the Christian Church derived its services from the Synagogue.”

It was but fitting that so wonderful a mystery as the adorable mystery of Transubstantiation should have a ceremonial.

“Si quid est in rebus humanis plane divinum [says Pope Urban VIII. in his Letter prefixed to every copy of the Missal], quod nobis superni cives (si in eos invidia caderet) invidere possent, id certe est sacrosanctum missæ sacrificium; cujus beneficio fit, ut homines quadam anticipatione possideant in terris coelum, dum ante oculos habent, et manibus contractant ipsum coeli terræque conditorem.”

Two things we read with regard to the Deity—one in the Old Testament, and one in the New—both typical of the several dispensations: “And behold thunders began to be heard, and lightning to flash, and a very thick cloud to cover the mount, and the noise of the trumpet sounded exceeding loud; and all Mount Sinai was in a smoke, *because the Lord*

¹ See *Dublin Review*, April, 1890.

came down on it in fire, and the smoke arose from it as out of a furnace, and all the mount was terrible." (Exod. xix. 16-18.) "And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapping him in swaddling clothes, laid Him in a manger." (Luke ii. 7.)

Adorable and terrible as God indeed is, we see by the change from the law of fear to the law of grace how He desires to be approached, and by what rites and ceremonies He is to be surrounded and served in the Christian system. It is that of sweetness and meekness; and beautifully in all ages has the bride understood the wishes of the bridegroom, and interpreted them. Different times and different circumstances have made an outward change in the rites and ceremonial, but the spirit and the essence have always remained the same.

In the first centuries there were two things that prevented the expansion of the Church's ceremonial. These were the persecutions of the emperors and their officers, in the first place; and in the second, the fear of exposing the holiest and most adorable of mysteries to the ridicule or the blasphemy of the profane. This latter is known as the "discipline of the secret," *disciplina arcani*. Between those apostolic times and our day there were two halting-places at which great and lasting changes were made in the outer formula of the Church's worship: one was in the time of Pope Gregory the Great, the other was at the Council of Trent. These regulated the ceremonial of Holy Mass, as we now have it, and as it will be to the end of time in all probability.

It is in the very nature of the Church's constitution and tradition, as well as in the instinctive clinging of man to everything holy and venerable in the past, that we should have in our present ceremonial some of the prayers and rites of the apostolic times, and that some of those ceremonies which our priests to-day perform and exercise were consecrated by the very Apostles of the Lord, if not by the Lord Jesus Himself. St. Justin says:—"We Christians have learned the divine worship through the Apostles of Jesus, from the law and the word which have gone forth from

Jerusalem." (*Dial.*, cap. 110.) St. Justin lived during the second century, and ought to have known.

"Even such a cautious scholar as Dr. Lightfoot [writes Dr. Gasquet] was satisfied that in St. Clement's time—namely, the end of the first century—there must have been already not only a definite framework, but more or less uniformity in the substance and very language of the liturgical petitions."

Before the time of Pope Gregory there were, broadly, four great rites—the Alexandrian, the Roman, the Ambrosian, and the Hispano-Gallican or Mozarabic. Scholars and antiquarians spend a good deal of time, and usefully, in distinguishing the characteristics of these several rites; but for all purposes of usefulness for the general reader it will be sufficient to point out what Mass ordinarily in those early Christian times was like; that is, in its ceremonial.

Let us take the sacred words of consecration as our reckoning point. In the times of the persecutions, and in the Church of the catacombs, the ceremonial of Holy Mass, it is believed, consisted of little more than the consecration and the canon. This was due to the stress of the times in which the Church then existed. If the small but beautiful work of Cardinal Wiseman, *Fabiola*, be read with a careful eye, one will find in it many instructive and interesting details.

After emerging from the catacombs, and before obtaining religious freedom, the Church had to adapt its ceremonial again to the special necessities of the times. It was then that the unhappy lapses of her unfaithful children came to add its effect to that which the *disciplina arcani* had already made. In the earlier part of the Mass then there were the *Catechumens*, who were prevented assisting at the consecration by the rule of the *disciplina arcani*; these were therefore ordered by the deacon to leave the Church at an early stage. Next came the *Pentitents*, when certain prayers were said over them, in the responses to which all the faithful joined; they, too, were dismissed. Then began the *Oblata*, followed by the *Preface* and the *Canon*, somewhat substantially as we have them at present.

The ceremonial of Good Friday is looked upon as a relic

of those very early times, and answers, it is said, quite closely to what took place then.

It is very instructive to run through the parts of the Mass, and appoint their history and their time.

For the first psalm of the Mass, the *Judica*, it will be necessary to picture in imagination the old monasteries of the Middle Ages with their numerous community of monks. Leaving the sacristy in procession they chanted—and beautiful and appropriate it was—"Judge me, O God, and distinguish my cause," as they proceeded to the altar. The masses for the dead allowed none of the rejoicing expressed in this psalm, and as silence became the occasion they uttered not a word as they moved "solemn-paced and slow" between the bier and the altar. The Roman missal at the time of the revision looked on this psalm as so suitable that it adopted it.

The *Judica* is found in many mediæval missals, being probably derived from the Gallican Liturgy. It was generally recited as the celebrant went from the sacristy to the altar, but was recommended by Innocent III. to be said as at present."¹ The propriety of the *Confiteor* is at once evident. It is said to come down from the tenth or eleventh century.

The *Introit*, as the name implies, was something said or sung at the entrance of the priest. At first the *Introit* was sung by the choir while the sacred ministers were approaching the altar—as, for instance, is laid down in the missal on the Feast of the Purification before the blessing of the candles, and on Ash Wednesday before the blessing of the ashes. "The principal change," writes Dr. Gasquet, "in the *Introit* was that the celebrant came to recite these parts of the service which were at first choral. I suppose the custom began with private masses, and extended thence to all."

Of all the very ancient parts of the Mass that have remained to us, the prayer *Kyrie eleison*, solemn and pathetic, is among the most ancient. The very language—

namely, the Greek—tells us at once how very venerable it must be. This touching prayer was spoken over the catechumens in the early ages and during the ceremonial of the Holy Mass. It was likewise implored on the unfortunate persons known then as “energumeni” or “possessed,” and priests and people alternately chanted *Kyrie eleison*—“Lord have mercy.” It was spoken also over those unbaptized who had completed their term of trial and their course of instruction, and who were therefore called “competentes;” and, finally, it was prayed over all those who had in an hour of weakness denied the faith, and had returned penitent to the doors of the Church to be received back again.

Over these several groups it was spoken, and an appropriate prayer added, as may be seen by recurring again to the Good Friday ceremonial. Now, when all these things had changed, when catechumens were no longer as in the old times, and penitents no longer, then the special prayers were dropped as being without a necessity, and “the void was filled,” says Dr. Gasquet, “by the *Gloria in excelsis* and the Collects.”

It is not known who is the author of the beautiful canticle *Gloria in excelsis*; but it is much more to the matter to recognise its beauty and piety. “At the *Gloria in excelsis*,” says Cardinal Bona, “the priest, struck with wonder that a sinner in a strange land dare sing the *canticle of the angels*, should add affections of praise, adoration, thanksgiving, love, hope, zeal for the glory of God.” “The *Gloria in excelsis*” says the author of the *Explanation of the Liturgy of the Mass*, “dates from the very origin of Christianity . . . Of all the forms of praise by which we attempt to express our homages to the Almighty, it is one of the finest specimens ever composed by man.”

To understand the history of the Collects we have again to look back to the early ages. The numerous prayers of those times were collected by Popes Gregory and Gelasius, and, reduced in number, were set on the altars almost in their present form. Two things rendered this change necessary. The period of the catechumens and energumens had passed away, and the roll of the canonized saints who were hence-

forward to be honoured at the altars had greatly increased. It is not easy to say from what motive they came to be called Collects; whether from the saying of our Divine Lord, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name," &c., or because the prayer is an abridgment of all that might be asked; but, as has been seen, in their conception or idea they are of apostolic origin.

Of the Epistle and Gospel, it need not be said, that they are of most ancient date in the ceremonial of Holy Mass. The catechumens, and all who were prevented from assisting at the sacred parts of the Mass, were allowed to wait until the Epistle and Gospel were read, and the usual discourse given. Between these a psalm was generally sung, our Gradual taking the place of it; or the portion of a psalm, as we have in Sundays of Lent. Two interesting things it is well to mention with regard to the Epistle and Gospel. Cardinal Bona says:—"A certain priest was accustomed to say that he daily attended two most eloquent and efficacious discourses, the Epistle and the Gospel, and used to listen to them as if Jesus Christ and the Apostles were present delivering them." The anonymous author of the *Liturgy of the Mass* says: "In the ages of faith, at the reading of the Gospel, the Knights of Malta, as also the once gallant Polish nobility, drew their swords from the scabbards, and stood in a military attitude, thereby testifying their readiness to shed their blood in defence of Christianity."

The Creed, as it presently stands, cannot be of apostolic times. There is no doubt about its age; the Council of Nice was held A.D. 325. At what time it was introduced into the Mass, or under what circumstances, we do not exactly know. Two things are probable—first, that some kind of common form of belief had been repeated either customarily or occasionally in the early times; and secondly, that this creed on account of the prevailing Arian heresy was inserted to take its place. There is always great merit in saying an Act of Faith, or repeating one of the Creeds. "By faith God requires of us to humble our *understandings* to His word, as by our external homage we humble our bodies to do Him reverence," says the author of the *Explanation*

of the *Liturgy of the Mass*. "The Creed was first brought into the Mass in the West by the Third Council of Toledo, in 589." (Dr. Gasquet.)

At the Offertory we reach the point where the Sacrifice really and truly begins.

"This part of the Liturgy rises greatly in importance over the preceding. This is properly the commencement of the Sacrifice. This is the moment in which the Church really begins to act, and to offer the victim. This may, in some degree, be considered an essential part of the Sacrifice. The more we approach the essential act of the Sacrifice, the more interesting does the matter become." (Author of the *Liturgy of the Mass*.)

Previous to this, in the early times, the catechumens and all others who were not allowed to assist at the secret parts of the Mass, were ordered to depart. This fact must have made it exceedingly solemn in the eyes of those who remained.

The act, which the priest now performs, is as ancient as the Church; but the prayer (at least in its present form), seems to be not older than the eleventh or twelfth century. "There were no fixed prayers at the Offertory until the twelfth century, the priest, before then, making the offering in silence." (Dr. Gasquet.) Those short but beautiful prayers, which the priest says at the Offertory, are taken from the missals used in Spain and in Gaul. "The prayer *In Spiritu humilitatis*, is extracted from a longer one composed by Azarias, one of the Three Children, whilst he was in the flames of the Babylonian furnace." (Card. Bona.) "These oblations of bread and wine, the priest ought to make with all possible fervour and devotion, as if he were the only priest in the whole world, and the salvation of every soul depended on that one mass." (*Idem.*) The prayer, *Orate fratres*, seems to have been very ancient; and from the nature of the prayer, it is what we might expect. The answer given to this prayer was different in different places and at different times. In some places the answer was—*Spiritus Sanctus supervenient in te, et virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi*. In the early times, the priest said *Orate fratres*, and nothing more, that being deemed sufficient.

Later on, that is towards the eighth century, the remainder of the prayer was added, as if for explanation. That most likely accounts for the priest saying, now, the words *Orate fratres* aloud, and the rest in secret. The author of *The Liturgy* has some beautiful thoughts on this prayer, and the accompanying action of the priest.

“The principal motive [he says] of the prayer *Orate fratres* is, that the nearer we approach the moment of the Sacrifice, the more necessary do prayer and recollection become. The priest will not again turn round to the people . . . because he is now entering upon the more solemn part of the Mass . . . and must not henceforth be distracted by turning away from this sacred object. When, therefore, the priest turns to the people for the last time . . . you may look upon him as taking leave of you, and entering into the Holy of Holies. Hitherto he has prayed like one of yourselves, standing in the midst of you . . . but now he separates from the people . . . and like Moses, leaving them at the foot of the mount, he ascends to converse with God alone.”

Prefaces are of very ancient date, and were always variable. For one of the prefaces, that of a Sunday, we have, of course, the exact date given in the missal. About the time of St. Gregory, the prefaces had become so multiplied, that almost every mass had a special preface, as it had a special Gospel, or a special prayer. That great Pope, however, seeing the confusion that was arising from this fact, reduced them to their present number. “It is not easy to determine when, and under what influences, these parts of the Mass had their origin; but many of the collects and prefaces so closely resemble the thoughts and antithetical style of St. Leo, that we can hardly be wrong in ascribing them to him.” (Dr. Gasquet.)

The word *preface* itself seems not to have changed its original meaning:—

“The preface is an introduction to the Sacred Canon [says the author of *The Liturgy of the Mass*, and then he continues most beautifully]; after the *Orate fratres*, we beheld the priest quitting the people, and entering the Holy of Holies, not to return thence till the mystery of our redemption should be consummated. Accordingly, in the Greek and Oriental Churches a curtain is then let to fall, which divides the sanctuary from the body of the

church; and in the Western Church, it was formerly the custom to close the gates of the sanctuary before the preface, in order to announce the absence and separation of the priest from the rest of the faithful, while he is wrapt in holy communion with God, and honoured with His most intimate communications."

The *Sursum Corda*, according to St. Cyprian (*De Or. Dom.*, 31), was recited in his day, and received the same answer then as now—*Habemus ad Dominum*. This marks it as being very old.

"Then follows the preface [says Cardinal Bona], which is as it were the prologue to the Sacrifice. The Trisagion contains three songs of praise, and two of petition. First, the sanctity, power, and supreme dominion of God are told in the words—*Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth*. Secondly, the glory which shines forth so conspicuously in so many of His creatures in heaven and on earth—*Pleni sunt coeli et terra gloria tua*. Third, Christ our Lord is magnified in the words—*Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini*. The two petitions are contained in the double repetition of the words *Hosanna in Excelsis*. This hymn therefore is placed before the canon, to remind the priest that he stands before the throne of divine Majesty."

In the Canon of the Mass, we touch upon apostolic times. The word *canon* signifies a law or rule :—

"This part of the Mass is called the *canon* [says Card. Bona], that is, the rule which is observed in the Sacrifice of the Mass. It is composed, as the Council of Trent testifies, of the words of our Lord, of the traditions of the Apostles, and of the institutions of the Sovereign Pontiffs."

We have at hand two ready means of corroborating the antiquity claimed for the canon. If we look to the names of the Apostles and martyrs mentioned in the prayer before the consecration, we find no names but the names of the Apostles and the very early Popes and martyrs; in the prayer after the elevation, that contains the names of the Apostles and martyrs, we find, again, none but those who lived in the times of the Apostles, or immediately succeeding.

In the first list we find Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, Philip, Matthew, and (linked together where one would expect to find Simon and Jude, as on the feast 28th Oct.) we find Simon and Thaddeus (or Timothy); then

the Popes Linus, Cletus, Clement; the martyrs Xystus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Laurence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian.

In the second list we read—with John (what John this is, I cannot say, whether it is St. John the Evangelist, or John Mark, or some martyr named John); with Stephen, Matthias (evidently the Apostle selected into the place of Judas, though here written after Stephen), Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter; and the virgin martyrs, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecily, Anastasia; all early saints and martyrs.

If the canon were of the fourth or fifth century, it would have the saints of the third or fourth, in all probability.

Our second means of corroborating the antiquity claimed for the canon is found in the statements made in the lives of two of the early Popes. Of St. Gregory the Great, we read:—"Multa constituit . . . ut adderetur in canone *diesque nostros in tuæ pace disponas.*" (Rom. Brev., 12th March.) Of St. Leo I.:—"Statuit, ut in actione mysterii diceretur *sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam.*" (*Ibid.*, 11th April.)

The interpolation of St. Gregory is found in the prayer *Hanc igitur*, before the consecration, and refers, perhaps, to the disturbances in the Church from the heresies of those times; that of St. Leo in the prayer *Supra quæ*, after the consecration, and rounds off the prayer in the style customary with that great writer.

Now, if these two phrases have been put into these prayers, then the prayers themselves existed before the times of these two Popes; for, otherwise they could not have inserted them.

"The Canon of the Mass must have undergone changes of uncertain extent [writes Dr. Gasquet] during the first two centuries after apostolic times. By the beginning of the fourth century it must have very nearly existed in its present shape (pseudo-Ambrose), and the few alterations which St. Gregory the Great made in it, left it fourteen hundred years ago the same as we have it now."¹

At times, in the very early ages, the canon itself was shortened, in order to get over the holy ceremonies more quickly, and thereby escape detection. "It is the opinion of the older liturgiologists that, under stress of persecution, the Holy Sacrifice was offered in the early ages, *with merely the words of the Institution and the Lord's Prayer.*"¹ Nor is it any derogation from its unchangeableness, that we find a special *Communicantes* for Christmas, for the Feast of the Epiphany, for Easter, for the Ascension, and for Pentecost. Substantially the canon is the same, and these special prayers are only the remains of the numerous ones, that existed before Pope St. Gregory's time.

It is to be borne in mind, with regard to the two mementoes of the living and of the dead, the Roman rite is the only one that has them separated; one before, and the other after, the consecration. The other rites, that is to say, the Oriental, the Alexandrian, and the Mozarabic, have them, we are told, after the consecration.

The Pax, too, which in the early Church was instituted for a twofold purpose, to typify the charity that existed among the members of the one body; and, secondly, as a means to recognise strangers, had its place, as its second object insinuates, before the commencement of the sacred mysteries; and in all the other rites it holds that place still. In ours, it need not be said, that its place in Solemn Mass is immediately before the Holy Communion, and following on the prayer *Dona nobis pacem*.

With regard to the elevation of the sacred elements, it is to be remembered that it was only at the time of Berengarius that the *major* elevation was ordered by the Church, in order that the faithful might adore our Divine Lord, who is really, truly, and substantially present in the sacred species. In the Greek Church the earlier custom, that is, of a *minor elevation*, still prevails.

In the prayer, *Per quem haec omnia*, before the Pater Noster, the words *sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis, and praestas nobis*, are supposed to have referred originally, not to the

¹ Dr. Gasquet, *ibid.*

sacred species, but to new fruits which were laid on the altar at the moment. Anyone reading over the Holy Thursday service, where the bishop leaves the adorable elements on the altar, and goes down to a table to bless the holy oils, will understand how such things may, without irreverence, be interjected into the sacred service.

“It seems from the Gelasian Sacramentary [says Dr. Gasquet], that the words, *Per quem haec omnia . . . praestas nobis*, were originally the end of a benediction of the new fruits of the spring. Many mediæval missals, too, direct that bread, oil, and other things should be blessed at this part of the Mass ; so that the custom of doing so must have long prevailed. This appears to give the original meaning of the words *haec omnia bona creas*, though there is no doubt that [as Le Brun urges], they are now very fitly applied to the Blessed Sacrament.”¹

R. O. KENNEDY.

(To be continued.)

THE ORIGIN OF PLAIN-CHANT.

THERE has never been any period throughout the whole history of the human race which has not been inspirited and enlivened, solaced and consoled, by the harmony of melodious sounds. I do not mean to say that all nations, much less all individuals, are equally alive to the pleasures of music ; but in some form or other it is acceptable and pleasing, in a greater or less degree, to almost all men ; and it can safely be said, without fear of contradiction, that there is no more potent agency, in the natural order of things, to stir the soul of man, to arouse him to actions of a noble or ignoble kind, as the case may be ; to calm his irritation or incite him to fury ; to inspire him with anger, love, pride, hatred, contempt, and so forth, than the magic power of music. Such being the case, the Church of God, perceiving it to be a most efficacious means, when rightly used, to raise

¹ *Dublin Review*, April, 1890.

men's hearts to heaven, has introduced into her sanctuaries music of all kinds, vocal and instrumental, harmonized and unisonous, according to the needs and necessities of the times. But while encircling in her wide embrace all kinds and species of melody, there is one dearly cherished child which she presents to the congregation of the faithful as her own, which she herself has tenderly nurtured and brought to perfection ; in other words, the official music of the Western liturgies, the so-called Gregorian Chant.

Some months ago I had the pleasure of addressing a few remarks to the readers of the I. E. RECORD, on the subject of Church song. I will not, therefore, weary them by again going over the same ground, but will confine myself to a single point upon which I did not then touch, namely, from whence did the Church obtain the musical idiom embodied in the melodies of St. Gregory ?

A very interesting and valuable treatise, entitled *Le Chant Grégorien sa genèse et son développement*, and one which throws a considerable light on the above question, has lately been published by the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Tournay. We will, therefore, take as our guide in the inquiry which we are about to make in the following pages, the learned author of this work, Dom Laurent Janssens, of St. Benedict's Abbey, Maredsous, that stately Gothic pile, situated on one of the oak-crowned hills overlooking the valley of Montaigle, in the province of Namur, where Christian song and Christian art has found such a congenial habitation.

Divinely invested with the mission of restoring all things in Christ ("instaurare omnia in Christo"), the Church, the lawful heir of all antique culture, appears to us, from her very origin, as setting forth, with a breadth of view and divine comprehensiveness, truly admirable, to her great work of renovation. Jealous of repelling anyone from her bosom, of losing any of the treasure accumulated by humanity, she makes her own, as much as possible, the civilization of the diverse nations by which she finds herself surrounded. She borrows from the architecture in vogue the elements of her temples ; she adapts national costumes

to the exigencies of her worship; she preaches Christ in the language of Jerusalem, of Athens, and of Rome; she even goes so far as to combat the superstitious rites of an idolatrous worship, by liturgical ceremonies proper to remedy the radical evil with which they are polluted, while preserving at the same time all which they contain of the beautiful and the good.

Thus, for example, were instituted the Rogations, and the processions of the 25th of March and of Candlemas, in order thereby to combat the Ambarvalia in honour of Ceres, the Robigalia in honour of Robigus, and the Lupercalia in honour of Pan.

Faithful to the same principle, the Church does not hesitate to hymn Jehovah, Christ, and His Virgin Mother, in the same musical idiom which was wont to re-echo in honour of Jupiter, Apollo, and Cybele. With words such as these Dom Janssens closes the introduction to his work—words so concise and clear, clothing sentiments so broad and true, and at the same time so apt to the present inquiry, that my readers will pardon me for translating them *in extenso*, and almost literally.

It will, perhaps, be well, before going any further, to consider what was the nature of this antique musical idiom, of which Dom Janssens speaks, at the epoch when the Church thus assimilated it to herself, and made it her own. For ages the study of ancient Greek music was neglected and despised. This apathy on the part of modern artists in respect to the musical productions of a race whose masterpieces in poetry, eloquence, architecture, sculpture, and painting have never ceased to be the admiration of the civilized world, was, doubtless, to be attributed to the dearth of matter on which to set to work, the Greek musical compositions transmitted to us being both fragmentary in character, and limited in number. Thanks, however, to the labours of Vincent, Bellermann, Hermann, Boeck, Roszbach, &c., all this is a thing of the past, and we are at length beginning to have a more just appreciation of the music of the Hellenes. Without taking count of its archaic and rudimentary period, all record of which is lost in the

mist of ages, the history of Greek music may be divided into three great epochs :—

1. The period of formation, embracing about three hundred years, and extending from the first Olympiad, 776 B.C., to the advent of popular government at Athens.

2. The period of splendour, lasting for little over a century only, and ending with Alexander.

3. The period of decay, by far the longest of the three, bringing us down to the final overthrow of Greek art under Theodosius, A.D. 394, and covering nearly seven hundred and fifty years.

We will, later on, take a rapid glance at each of these periods, but before doing so it may be convenient, to make a few general observations on the modes and metres employed by the ancient Greeks, as well as on their method of notation. With regard to modes or fundamental scales, let it suffice to call to mind, that Greek music was enriched by no less than seven, far more essentially different one from another than the major and minor modes of modern music. Each scale began on one of the notes of the octave, and was diatonic, chromatic, or enharmonic, according as the tetrachords which composed them were made up of two tones and a semi-tone, of a tone and a-half and two semi-tones, or of an interval of two tones and two quarter tones.

The enharmonic system is said to have been invented by Olympus, and was much in vogue during several centuries. The fact that such delicately-tinted music should have remained popular for so long, shows not only the extreme sensitiveness and accuracy of the Hellenic ear, but also what skill and *finesse* the ancient Greeks must have attained in the execution of their melodies. The following table gives the names of the various tones, together with the notes on which each scale began :—

- | | |
|----------------------|----|
| 1. Lydian..... | C. |
| 2. Phrygian..... | D. |
| 3. Dorian..... | E. |
| 4. Hypolydian..... | F. |
| 5. Hypophrygian..... | G. |
| 6. Hypodorian..... | A. |
| 7. Mixolydian..... | B. |

Of these seven modes, the Dorian (the Hellenic mode *par excellence*), the Phrygian, and the Lydian, were considered fundamental. Plato, however, only admits the two former in his *Republic*. Thus much for modes and scales : now as to metre.

In the early days of Greek art, the Hellenes followed no other rhythm than that of the number of syllables, combined with metrical accent. But later on, to this popular metre, called *Δημοτικός*, and derived from the metre of the Aryan or Indo-European tongues, succeeded a more refined rhythm, called for that reason *πολιτικός*, and based on the prosodial quantity of the syllable.

Treatises on Prosody tell us how, by diverse combinations of long and short syllables, were formed what were termed feet, the Hellenic equivalent to our bars. The short syllable was taken as the unit, and may be said to correspond to the crotchet, while the long syllable was regarded as being equal to two short syllables. But whereas modern music oscillates between tetrapody or groups of four bars, and infinite melody, without any systematic grouping, the Greeks delighted in all kinds of combinations, the feet being arranged in groups or verses, the Sapphic, the Asclepiadean, the Hexameter, and so forth, and the verses thus formed, being themselves also, in their turn, grouped together in diverse different ways. Thus arose that balanced disposition of the various musical members, that "Eurythmie" to which the Greek ear was so sensible ; more so, perhaps, than it is even possible for us, in the present day, to imagine.

The few fragments of ancient music, whether Greek or Roman, which still remain to us are of a didactic nature, in the form of theoretical examples, and in these the notation employed is almost exclusively alphabetic ; but in the arrangement of the order in which the letters were placed, the Greeks seem to have had two systems. The first consisted in applying the series of their letters to the diverse strings of their instruments, in the order of their relative importance. This method was used for instrumental music. The other system, which is of more recent date, and was reserved exclusively for vocal music, consisted

in taking the letters in alphabetical order, and in thus making them represent the different diatonic degrees of the scale, while for the non-diatonic intervals their form or position was modified.¹

The first period of Greek music saw the birth, among numerous other rhythmical combinations, of the Sapphic strophe, so common in the hymns of the Church : “*Ecce surgentes, Ecce jam noctis*” of St. Gregory the Great, for example, “*Ut queant laxis, O nimis felix,*” and “*Antra deserti*” of Paul the Deacon, “*Iste confessor,*” and so forth : developed the art of playing stringed and wind instruments, the former for the cultus of Apollo, the latter for that of Bacchus : created various different kinds of compositions which Plato classifies as hymns (*ᾠμος*), threnes (*θρήνος*), including nuptial and funeral songs, paeans (*παιάν*), and dithyrambes (*διθύραμβος*) ; and lastly, instituted those great musical contests which had such a vast influence on the music of after ages, namely, the Carneia in honour of Apollo for the lyre, and the Pythia of Delphi for wind instruments.

It would be tedious to enumerate all the great minstrels of this epoch when poetry and music, hand in hand, found in an intimate union the secret of their marvellous force. But we must not omit to mention, alongside of the great lyric poets Anacreon, Simonides, and Pindar, and those princes of tragedy Æschylus, and the divine Sophocles, as Cicero calls him, the names of two women whose surpassing merit sheds a lustre on the age in which they dwelt—Sappho of Lesbos, the rival of Alcæus, and Corinna of Tanagra, the confidential friend and adviser of Pindar. Triumphant by the might of their genius over the prejudice of the times in which their lot was cast, and breaking through the trammels imposed by a society so unjust, and sometimes so cruel, to their sex, these two musician-poetesses stand, as it were, midway between the prophetesses of Israel and those devout women of the new law whose sweet notes have from time to time re-echoed throughout the length and breadth of Christendom. On the one hand, they recall from afar off Deborah and

¹ See Dom Pothier's *Les Melodies Gregoriennes*, chapter iii.

Miriam ; while, on the other, they seem to prelude the soft accents of Elpis and the harmonious charms of Hildegard.

The second epoch—that epoch which Plato wittily qualifies as theatrocratic—opens with Euripides, the successor of Sophocles, he whom Aristotle calls the most tragic of all the poets. Alongside of him flourished Aristophanes—that prince of the old comedy, as Quintilian calls him, and the first inventor of tetrameters. These two masters may be said to form the connecting link between the first and the second period.

The music of the age which we are now considering was, so to speak, less austere than that of the preceding epoch. Art began to sacrifice something of its purity, its rhythmic delicacy, to colour, to brilliance, to passion. The tendency was to mingle together in the same composition various metres and modes, and the use of the chromatic scale became more and more common. Owing in great measure to the musical contests of the Odæum at Athens, inaugurated by Pericles, instrumental music, in the *technique* of which incontestable progress had been made, sought to enlarge its sphere of action, while laudable efforts were made—too often, however, fruitless—for the production of grander and more powerful effects.

The music of this period was diversely appreciated by the best judges of the day. Plato, Pherecrates, and Aristophanes criticize it bitterly ; the great comedian, indeed, stigmatizes the new masters as executioners and torturers of melody ; but, on the other hand, Aristotle and Aristoxenus are no less loud in its praise, speaking of it with sympathy and respect. Whichever view was correct, there can be no doubt that many of the masters of this epoch were artists of eminent talent, and among these may be cited Aristoclide, Melanippides, Phrynis, Timotheus, called the prince of citharists, Philoxenus, and Telestes of Selinontus.

We have now reached the third and last period of Greek musical art. The barren efforts made during the second epoch to enlarge its sphere of action, interrupted, as it were, its upward flight, and neither the patronage of Alexander, nor the tentatives of Aristoxenus for its rehabilitation, nor

the conservatoire of Teos, nor the powerful impulse of the Alexandrian school, could infuse into Greek music new life and vigour. Nevertheless, it lingered on in an enfeebled and semi-moribund state until the last celebration of the Olympic games, in the tenth year of the reign of Theodosius, A.D. 394, when, so far as concerns Greece itself, Greek music may be said to have died. Transplanted, however, to Rome, where one last and unsuccessful effort was made for its restoration, the ancient music, though greatly fallen from its former lofty estate, still there reigned supreme when Christianity triumphantly entered the capital of the Cæsars.

Such was the music with which the Church found herself face to face, when after three centuries of bloody warfare she took possession of Rome. In what measure did she make this antique art her own? What modifications did she introduce in order to adapt it to the exigencies of her liturgy? These are the questions to which we are now about to turn.

In order to have a just appreciation of what the Church borrowed from Greco-Roman art, it is most important to distinguish clearly two elements in her liturgy—to wit, the text in prose, and the text in verse. For the latter she adapted the measured rhythm of Greco-Roman music; nevertheless she made of this no hard-and-fast rule, as show clearly the melodies which she employed later on for the “*Salve Sancta Parens*,” the “*Alma Redemptoris*,” the “*Salve jubete Deo*,” the “*Hic vir despiciens*,” and various others, the rhythm of which is oratorical only, albeit the texts themselves are hexameters. It should be further borne in mind that Catholic hymnody largely employed for her sacred texts the use of a rhythm based on metrical accent only, that species of verse which Horace speaks of as *Horridus Saturnius*, and which still remained popular alongside the prosodial rhythm. As to the non-measured portions of the liturgical text, for them the Church knew no other than an oratorical rhythm based on accent; and if we consider the origin of Christianity, and from whence came by far the larger part of the liturgy, it seems clear that Jewish art was, to a great extent, responsible for this innovation.

The continual chanting of the psalms alone could not but have infused a predominant taste for that free rhythm so loved of the singers of Israel, and doubtless more than one melodic cadence has passed from the synagogue to the agape (*ἀγάπη*), from the agape to the catacombs, and from the catacombs to the basilica. But this was not the only change which the Church introduced in order to adapt the music of antiquity to the needs of her liturgical offices. Two other important modifications were made. The first of a temporary and disciplinary nature only, but which, nevertheless, had a marked influence on the after-development of the liturgy, as we shall see later on; the second of a more intimate and absolute character.

The first of these two changes consisted in this, that every form of instrumental music was rigidly excluded from the sanctuary, and the voice of the faithful alone—that living harp, as Cassiodorus beautifully put it—supplied the place of musical instruments. Now, it was customary with the Greeks and Romans to open and close their compositions with instrumental music without the accompaniment of the human voice; often, too, especially in hymns and choruses, little interludes would be introduced by the orchestra alone, between the various strophes and divisions into which the composition was divided, and the application of this practice to purely vocal music resulted in the introduction of those antiphons which have ever since played such an important rôle in the liturgies of the Catholic Church. Repeated before and after the psalm, and thus serving as an introduction to the tone, the antiphon represented the instrumental prelude and finale of Greco-Roman music.

When in antiphonal singing it became a sort of refrain continually recurring throughout the psalm or canticle, examples of which the Church still retains in her liturgy—notably the “Invitatorium” at Matins, and the “Lumen ad revelationem gentium” of the feast of the Purification—it took the place of those instrumental interludes in which the musicians of ancient Greece and Rome delighted to show their skill.

Do the jubilations or pneumes in which plain-chant abounds owe their origin to the same source?

But to return to our theme, the second, and perhaps the most important, of the above-mentioned modifications, was the absolute and irrevocable return to the unique use of the diatonic scale. Greek art had, as we have seen, long ago laid aside its pristine austerity, and in proportion as it receded from its former grandeur and dignity the chromatic element advanced to the fore, continually making further and further encroachments.

Long ere this Pherecrates had made music complain "Melanippides has enervated me, and made me effeminate," while Dionysius of Halicarnassus reproaches the masters of his time, not only with having mingled together all the metres and all the modes, but even the diatonic, the chromatic, and the enharmonic scales. But the Church would have nothing of this relaxed and enfeebled style of music, and again taking up the more healthy traditions of the period anterior to Melanippides returned to the exclusive use of the diatonic system. But, after all, it was not so much the changes and modifications which the Church introduced, as the new life which she breathed into the dry bones of Greco-Roman art; that "spirituality," as Dom Janssens puts it, "uniting in itself the burning zeal of the seers of the old law, and the comprehensive sweetness of her divine Founder," which enabled the Church to utter those glorious melodies, so simple and *naïve*, and at the same time so full of ardour and so entrancing, that for nearly a thousand years they held Europe spell-bound by the ravishing sweetness of their harmony.

Thus purified from the dross and corruption of centuries, ennobled by religious sentiment, revived by the life-giving breath of divine charity, the music of Pagan Rome and Athens was at length transformed into the chant of the universal Church, and so became the bond of union, the connecting link between the music of antiquity and the music of to-day, without which Greco-Roman music could never have developed into that majestic flood of harmony which is the glory of these latter ages, without which the art of Pindar, of Euripides, and Sappho could never have engendered the music of Bach, of Palestrina, of Haydn, of Mendelssohn, of Wagner and of Liszt.

F. E. GILLIAT SMITH.

CHURCHES IN THE EAST.

THE history of the Eastern Church forms at once some of the most brilliant as well as the most saddening pages in the general history of Christianity. The glories which the children of that Church won for themselves by the attitude they took during those early days when the faith they professed was a new and unknown faith—a faith preached not by the “wise” and “mighty,” but by twelve poor peasants from despised Galilee, and therefore one despised and sneered at by the trained intellects of the civilized world of those days, can never be forgotten. What the martyrs did at Rome, and wherever brute force endeavoured to crush out the spirit that was breathing a new life into a decaying world, in order to show the poor and lowly, the slave as well as his master, that there had come amongst men a new religion which recognised no distinction between Greek and Roman, between the conquered and the conqueror, between the slave and his master—that the children of the new faith in the countries of the East accomplished in the very domain wherein paganism believed itself impregnable—*i.e.*, learning and science for the great and the wise of those days. The very wisdom which the trained intellects of Athens and of Alexandria believed to be the heirloom and bulwark of paganism, became in the hands of the neophytes which the East gave unto Christianity the means, the arms, which finally destroyed paganism. The sneers and misrepresentations of Celsus, of Lucian, of Samosata, of Porphyrius, and later on of Proclus, and of Julian the Apostate, are only remembered to-day by the triumphant refutations which the Eastern Church put forth in support of Christianity. The names of Clement of Alexandria, of Origen, of Justin the Martyr, of Tatian the Syrian, of Cyril of Alexandria, and numberless others, are amongst the brightest stars in the intellectual firmament of early Christianity. Western Christianity has its own great names, but their sphere of action can scarcely be said to have lain in the battle of intellect against intellect—Christian sage against the

followers of Plato, of Aristotle, of Zeno, or of Epicurus. With the close of the fifth century the glory of the Eastern Church was at an end. Whatever names appear in the pages of its history after that period are but faint reflections of those of the preceding centuries, and are scarce remembered by the historian. They seem, as it were, pigmies following in the footsteps of giants.

It is not exactly necessary for the writer to point out the causes which led to this great falling off, in order to give a brief account of the history of that same Church; nor would the task of doing so satisfactorily be an easy one for the ecclesiastical historian. The object of the writer is rather to give a brief account of Christianity as it exists at the present day in the East; how it is divided; the number of its followers; its hierarchy or hierarchies, according to the number of sects into which the Eastern Church has shivered itself in the course of ages, both by schism as well as heresy—to place all that before the readers of the *I. E. RECORD*; but the efforts which are being made by Western Christianity to bring back to unity the separated branches of the great tree of Christianity will be treated of at another time.

It is impossible at this day to trace the causes which from the very dawn of Christianity seemed to divide the Church of Christ into two great bodies, viz., “East” and “West.” What might have seemed more probable and likely was, that if division there should be—not, indeed, as regards dogma or faith, but with regard to matters of liturgy, &c.—the Church should have been divided into as many sections as there were forms of liturgy instituted and practised by the various Apostles. Indeed it seems clear that each of the Twelve more or less practised a liturgy different from that of the others. Traces of such liturgies exist even to the present day in the practices of Churches which date their primitive founding back to the apostolic age; and the liturgies which exist both within as well as without the Catholic Church, even at the present day, are ascribed by all to one or other of the Apostles. However, this apparently natural division of the Christian Church became, in the course of time, a matter of secondary

importance, compared with that great division of East and West. Notwithstanding the very great importance to be attributed to the primacy bestowed by Christ Himself upon Peter, and for that reason naturally communicated by the latter to the Church which he personally founded, *i.e.*, the Church of Rome, still it would be far easier to account for the division of the Church into these great bodies, by the distinguishing characteristics marking off the children of the West from those of all the Churches of the East. Even this is unmistakably clear in the men whom both East and West produced, during the first couple of centuries, in defence of the common faith of both. At any rate, even without those distinguishing traits of the people which both East and West gathered into each other, the increasing greatness, the vastness of the countries where the banner of Imperial Rome floated, as well as the fervent zeal of her missionaries, made the Church of Peter completely overshadow any single Church founded by a single Apostle ; hence, in course of time, she became not merely a part of the Christian Church, but the half, the more important half. Whilst the various Churches in the East were scarcely able to plant the banner of the Crucified beyond the frontier of the Roman Empire in Asia Minor, Christian missions were beginning to flourish in countries in the West, where the banner of Imperial Rome was unknown. Indeed the words of Tertullian, *sanguis Martyrum, semen Christianorum*, seems to be applicable to the missions founded by the Church of Rome. Persecution in the Eastern Churches crushed rather than helped to propagate the new faith. And a mere glance at the facts which both present, even in our day, would make the statement but the clearer. Wherever Rome's missionaries went, wherever they preached, the faith that sprang up in the hearts of their hearers was such that it crushed out for ever every trace of the old religion. The Druidism of the Celts is but a name ; its very tenets and practices being now forgotten. The exact contrary happened in the East, and to-day the traveller can come across vestiges of creeds that to European minds died out centuries ago.

This distinction of East and West can scarcely be said to have been well-defined before the middle, or rather the close, of the fourth century. Each particular Church, following its own liturgy, having its own peculiar rights and practices, was far too weak to make its influence felt as a factor in the world of Christendom, especially when in contrast with the increasing importance of the Latin or Western Church. There was no one among the several Churches¹ in the East capable of leading the others, especially as a kind of barrier against what seemed even probable in the Latinizing of all Christendom. So the moment had scarcely arrived for such a union ere the East possessed a city which should rival Rome. The founding of Constantinople decided the matter: and the historian is hardly at a loss to account for the unanimity with which the prelates of the entire East who met at the second Œcumenical Council, held in the "New Rome," decided upon raising that city to a rank that would place it on a level with that of the capital of the Western Empire, and make its patriarchs representatives of the entire Eastern Church. Notwithstanding the rejection of the fourteenth² canon of that Council, in which it was decreed that, "*the Bishop of Constantinople shall take his rank next to the Bishop of Rome*"—notwithstanding the rejection of that canon by the entire Western Church, and its formal rejection a second time when again inserted in the decrees published by the fourth Œcumenical Council, held at Chalcedon (451), by Leo the Great, to whom the decrees of that Council were brought for confirmation,¹ it was quite clear to all that sooner or later the East would—at least

¹ Though the term *Eastern Church* is oftentimes used to denote the entire body of Christians living in the East, and in liturgy differing from those in the West, so used, however, it is vague. For not one "Church" alone, as the term is used in these pages—*i.e.*, a nation or body of Christians having a liturgy peculiarly their own—but many "Churches" existed there from the beginning; though it is true that in the course of time the Patriarchate of Constantinople arrogated to itself, and to all using its liturgy, the exclusive title of the "Eastern Church."

² Canon iii., is also to the same effect. Confer. Alzog, *Church History*, vol. i., pp. 385, 427, and 465; also *Harduin*, i., ii.

³ Confer. Alzog, *ut supra*.

in rivalry with the West—be united under the leadership of the patriarchs of Constantinople. Events, however, were then taking place in the East which rendered the aimed-at leadership more or less nugatory. Both Arianism and semi-Arianism, though lingering in many parts of Christendom during the fifth century, may be said to have been practically swept away at the close of the fourth century. The embers, however, remained, and unfortunately, were sufficiently warm to arouse the zeal of the East in the intellectual combats that were being still thereupon held. It was, in fact, the disputes which arose out of the lingering embers of that heresy that rent the Eastern Church into these factions which it is divided into, even to the present hour, and which finally crushed out every vestige of the heresy that logically was parent to those that arose in opposition to it.

The first tokens of a real split occurring in the Eastern Church are met with during the early part of the fifth century. This was the heresy and schism of Nestorius. Educated in the famed theological school of Antioch—a school whose principles were in a great measure untrammelled with these of the Neo-Platonism of the Alexandrian—the active mind of Nestorius instantly saw in the Arian heresy the fruit of the allegorizing exegesis of the Alexandrians, as well as the utterly inadequate idea of the Incarnation or Redemption presented by that theory. He, therefore, began to construct a new one that would, as he believed, fully explain the matter; and in this attempt went to the exact opposite of the other. Arianism was *destructive*; the new theory *constructive*. Arianism defined what Christ was *not*; Nestorianism attempted to explain *what He was*. Perhaps for this reason the followers of Nestorius have been able to hold together as a Church even to the present day.

Nestorianism, as is well known, was condemned by the Council of Ephesus (431); but it did not decrease on that account. It was taken up and defended by some of the leading minds of the theological school of Antioch;² and it

² This theological school was founded by Lucian, a priest of Antioch, towards the close of the third century. Its object was to free Biblical exegesis from the allegorizing method of the Alexandrian School. Conf. Alzog, vol. i., page 270.

appears that the heresy went eastwards, and was largely embraced by the Christians in Mesopotamia, Persia, and along the confines of the Chinese Empire. It appears that, according to old traditions, St. Thomas the Apostle preached the Gospel in all these countries; hence the Christians therein called themselves Christians of St. Thomas, and had, as they have to-day, a very ancient liturgy attributed by them to the Apostle. They are also called Chaldeans, because their head-quarters have always been in Chaldea or modern Mesopotamia. At the present day they are far from being the important sect they once were. They are to be found only in small numbers, principally in Southern Armenia and along the western frontier of Persia. They are, however, to be met with in a few cities in Syria; but elsewhere, in Asia Minor and Palestine, they are nowhere numerous enough to form even a small community. Like all other ancient Churches having a particular liturgy, they are, at present, divided into two classes. Some of them have renounced their errors, and are in union with the Catholic Church. In the East these latter arrogate to themselves exclusively the title Chaldeans, and call their quondam co-religionists simply Nestorians. Both bodies are ruled by their respective patriarchs, each calling himself patriarch of Ctesiphon and Babylon. Both reside at Mosul. The Catholic, or united section, have also an archbishop at Diarbekir in Kurdistan, besides a few bishops, whose titles are rather honorary than effective. The entire number of Catholic Chaldeans can scarcely be said to surpass the number of 10,000, and of the Nestorian Chaldeans it is rather exaggeration than the opposite to put their number at 100,000.¹ Such, then, is all that now remains of a Church whose children in former times spread themselves over the entire continent of Asia, preaching the Gospel in the wilds of Tibet, and even in the interior of the Chinese Empire.

The heresy of Nestorius had scarcely sprung into existence when it found opponents equally daring, equally

¹ Confer. *Condition of the Population of Asia Minor and Syria*, published by Her Majesty's Government, 1881.

courageous in their attacks upon it, as had been Nestorius himself in his opposition to everything that had the appearance of Arianism. Throughout the length and breadth of the entire East, Nestorianism found opposition. The fight, however, was entered into in real earnest by a monk of Constantinople, named Eutyches. Equally intent upon a constructive theory as regards the nature of Christ, as was Nestorius, against whom he now led off the fight, he boldly advanced the principle, that if the teaching of Nestorius, who would deny the divine nature of the Son of Mary, be false, it necessarily follows that, as it is prohibited to admit two Christs, there can be only "one" in every sense; and, consequently, the Flesh which the Godhead assumed in the Womb of Mary became a part, so to speak, of the Divine Essence. Hence the name of Monophysites.

It is remarkable to consider the rapidity with which this theory spread throughout the East. It was quite natural that the teaching should find advocates in the theological school¹ of Alexandria; and, as a matter of fact, the patriarch Dioscorus, who succeeded St. Cyril in that see (444) became one of its most strenuous advocates, and by his influence it spread throughout the length and breadth of Egypt. It is easy to explain how this new theory should have found advocates in Alexandria. The Neo-Platonism of the Alexandrian School was always inclined to the doctrine of "Emanation"—a doctrine that was essentially pantheistic in its tendencies. And if Monophysitism may seem, at first sight, the extreme opposite of Arianism, it is, in very truth, an equally just conclusion drawn from the same equally false principle.

The heresy was likewise spread in Palestine² by agents of

¹ This celebrated school owes its origin to Pantænus (flor. 180), who had been converted from paganism. As the greater number of its first adherents, previous to their conversion, had been trained up in the principles of Neo-Platonism—especially its second master, Clemens Alexandrinus (*obit.* 217)—the whole tendency of its principles was to harmonize the philosophy of Greece with Christianity, and thus facilitate the conversion of those imbued with the principles of the philosophy of Greece. (Alzog, vol. i., page 260.)

² Confer. Leontii, *Hierosolymit. Contr. Monophysit.*, in Gallandus, tom. xii.; also Alzog, vol. i., *Universal Church History*, pp. 428, &c.

the Alexandrian School, and in a short time the whole of the country seemed to be infected with Monophysite principles. From Syria Eutychianism spread to Armenia, and so great was the torrent that the efforts of the Council of Chalcedon (451) were able to produce but little reaction. In Syria, however, as will be seen later on, a reaction did take place; but, unfortunately, to be followed by a movement that gave a stability to the Monophysites there that has enabled their Church to exist even to to-day. Such then was the field in which the Monophysite heresy had been sown during the fifth century, and ever since then it has retained its primitive limits. There were, therefore, three distinct races as well as liturgies, or rather Churches having distinct liturgies, contaminated with Monophysitism, viz., the Armenian Church, the Church of Syria, and that of old Egypt.³ The Armenians, according to their own traditions, were converted to Christianity by the preaching of St. Thaddeus, to whom they ascribe their present liturgy. This liturgy was, however, somewhat modified by St. Basil (329-379); and it is in this modified form that it is used at the present day. However, the one of all others who laboured most effectually in the conversion of Armenia was St. Gregory the Illuminator (fl. 320), and to this day the greater part of the Armenians go by the name of "Gregorians." Century after century various attempts were mutually made by the Western Church as well as by the Armenian towards a re-union; but the effects were but transient. At the Council of Lyons (1274) a union was effected with the Western Church through the influence of some of their bishops as well as their king. The kingdom of Armenia was utterly destroyed ere the close of the fourteenth century by the Tartars, and after them by the Osmanlis; and their exiled king, the last of his race, Leo de Lusignan, died at Paris, 1393.

¹ Christianity was introduced into Egypt by St. Mark, who gave the Church its liturgy. This liturgy was afterwards superseded in the See of Alexandria by that of Constantinople; but the majority of the Egyptians clung to the old liturgy. They still go by the name of Copts, which was their former title.

The Eutychnian Armenians number in all Asia Minor about 4,000,000. Those who are in union with the Catholic Church, or the Catholic Armenians, may number about 300,000. The number given by his Eminence the late Cardinal Hassoun, in reply to the British Government,¹ would place the number of these latter, in the vilayets of Van, Diarbekir, Kharpoot, where they number most, at 60,000. Probably, including all Asia Minor, they number near 800,000. The Eutychnian Armenians are governed by three patriarchs, and two catholicos, or archbishops. The patriarchates are Jerusalem, Constantinople, and Sis in Cilicia. There are about fifty episcopal sees, the principal being in Armenia, and a few in Syria. The Catholic Armenians have but one patriarch, who continually resides at Constantinople. There is an archbishop resident at Diarbekir; and bishoprics at Yusgat, Broussa, Trebizond, Adana, Erzeroum, and a few other places, besides Aleppo, in Syria.

Another Church which had become infected with the heresy of Eutyches was that of Syria. This Church, though in a great measure separated from the Church of Christendom, ranks as one of the oldest and most venerable in history. Founded by St. James the Less, to whom, according to well-authenticated traditions, is due its liturgy, it ranked during the first few centuries as one of the most influential in Christendom. Within its confines were the famous theological schools of Cæsarea—this latter founded by Origen himself, and of Antioch. Its glory was, however, destined to fade away when the germs of Monophysitism had begun to eat into its very heart. For nigh a century after the breaking out of the Eutychnian heresy, the Syrian Church presented but one continued scene of violence, both friend as well as foe of Monophysitism resolving to remain within the Catholic Church. The fifth Œcumenical Council, held at Constantinople (553), drove the Monophysites farther than ever beyond the pale of Catholicity; and it was at this

¹ Confer. *Condition of Population of Asia Minor*, published by Her Majesty's Government. London, 1881. Page 99.

very time that Jacob Baradai,¹ who, when a monk at Antioch, had been driven from there on account of his adhesion to the heresy, and at this time through intrigue had been made bishop of Edessa, left his diocese, and preaching Monophysitism in Syria, Armenia, and Egypt, sought to unite all the followers of Eutyches in one body. He succeeded, however, in establishing the apostate Syrian Church on a firm basis. From him the Syrian Eutychians are, in the East, called even now Jacobites.

As with the Armenians, attempts have been made at various times to win the Syrian Church back to unity; but the results that arose from such attempts were always transitory; and at present the great majority of the Syrians are separated from the Catholic Church. The only places outside Syria and Palestine—in fact, Asia Minor—where Jacobites are at present to be found are Malabar, alongside S.W. coast of Hindostan, and the island of Ceylon, in both of which small congregations are still in existence, though their entire number scarcely reach 20,000. These are also quite independent of the Syrian Jacobites, from whom they are descended. The entire number of Jacobites in Asia Minor scarcely reach 100,000.² The Catholic part of the Syrian Church is equally unimportant, and its numbers may *possibly* reach 30,000.³ The liturgy of both branches of the Syrian Church is the same, it being in old Syriac. As regards hierarchy or Church government, both have as their respective spiritual heads a patriarch of Antioch. The Jacobite patriarch generally resides in a monastery near Mardin, a city some miles from Diarbekir. The Jacobites, moreover, have an archbishop at Mosul, and bishops in Damascus and Diarbekir, as well as in a few other places in Asia Minor.

¹ Confer. Assemani, "Dissert. de Syris Jacobit.," in *Bibliothec. Oriental.*, tom. iii.

² Vide *Condition of the Population of Asia Minor and Syria*, published by Her Majesty's Government. London, 1881. Number there given as being in vilayet of Kurdistan is 12,000. Other vilayets contain each a few thousand. By counting females, 100,000 may be found in *all* Asia Minor.

³ Vide *Ecclesiastical Gazette*. Vienna, 1853. N.B.—All statistics about population in Turkey are, at most, merely approximative.

The patriarch of the Catholic Syrians resides in Aleppo, and these latter have likewise bishoprics with small congregations in Mardin, Damascus, Diarbekir, and Mosul. There are likewise a few communities of Catholic Syrians in Malabar, and these recognise the spiritual jurisdiction of the Catholic Syrian patriarch of Asia Minor. Another section of the Monophysite Church is that of the Copts,¹ with whom on account of similarity of dogma and liturgy, as well by reason of an intermingling of the two, are classed the Abyssinian Christians.

The Copts, who appear to be the lineal descendants of the old Egyptians, owe their conversion to Christianity to St. Mark, who was the first bishop in the patriarchal See of Alexandria, and gave to the Coptic Church its liturgy. The establishment of the celebrated theological school in the City of Alexandria, in a great measure weakened the Coptic or native element there in favour of the Greek; so much so, that, upon the breaking out of the Monophysite heresy, the two divided both with regard to dogma and liturgy. St. Cyril of Alexandria (*obit.* 441) at the moment of the breaking out in his See of the new heresy, introduced there, in order to bring about a closer union of the Catholic part of the Eastern Church as opposed to the growing factions, the liturgy of the Church of Constantinople, or that of the so-called Greek Church. The same happened in the patriarchal Sees of Jerusalem and Antioch. The Monophysite Copts, however, held to the old liturgy. These Copts, even to the present day, call themselves Jacobites, after Jacob Baradaï, though this title is pre-eminently given to the Monophysites of the Syrian Church. The Copts, at the present day, are by no means numerous; though, throughout all Egypt, almost every town contains a small community of them. They may number about 100,000; some, however, state that they reach 200,000. This is hardly probable, or includes many who should not be classed with the Copts. About six or eight thousand are called United Copts; these

¹ Confer. *Historia Coptor. Christian., Arabice et Latine Scripta.* Ed. Wetzer. Salzburg, 1828.

being in union with the Catholic Church, and have given up all opinions contrary to Catholic teaching. They retain, however, the old Coptic liturgy. The patriarch of the Monophysite Copts takes his title from Alexandria, yet resides near Cairo. He appoints the Abouna or Spiritual Head of the Abyssinian Church.

The Catholic Copts have but one bishopric, embracing all Egypt. The office is now vacant, and the Catholic Copts are governed by a Prefect Apostolic, the Rev. Fr. Zenebie, O.S.F., who resides at Cairo.

The only section of the Eastern Church that embraced for any length of time the heresy of Monothelism—which is really but a modified form of Monophysitism—was the Maronite. In a certain sense the Monothelite heresy caused more disturbance in the Christian Church than either Nestorianism or Eutychianism, and during its ferment the world saw the strange sight of Imperial decrees on dogma! However, before the close of the seventh century the sole adherents of Monothelism were to be found in the wilds of the Lebanon. The origin of the name Maronite is variously explained; the Maronites themselves deriving it from a St. Maro who lived in the Lebanon during the latter part of the fifth century. At the time when the Crusaders had penetrated into the plains of Syria, a movement towards unity with the Western Church took place among the Maronites. Difficulties arose at the time, and the union was not immediately effected. Latin monks from Jerusalem went amongst them from time to time, and the complete return of the Maronite Church and nation was effected at the Council of Florence. From that day to the present the Maronites have never wavered in their allegiance to Rome. Their liturgy is almost identical with that of the Syrian Church. They use azyme, however, and do not, like the Greeks, administer the chalice.

The hierarchy of the Maronite Church consists of a patriarch who lives at Kasruan in the Lebanon, and not far from Beyrout, and several bishoprics. The principal of these, besides a number of village dioceses in the Lebanon, are Beyrout, Damascus, Cyprus, and Aleppo. A peculiar feature

of the Maronite Church, is, that amongst all the sections of the Eastern Church in union with the Catholic Church of the West, it is at present the sole one where the practice of a celibate clergy is not strictly in force; however, of late, a strong tendency in that direction is quite apparent, and probably ere long a non-celebrate clergy, even among the Maronites, will be a thing of the past.

Such, then, were the Churches which had severed themselves from the Church of the East ere the close of the seventh century. The patriarchate of Constantinople, which for centuries had been aspiring to a supremacy over the East equal to that which the Church of Rome enjoyed over all Europe, at length saw that hoped-for supremacy rejected by half the East, and its authority recognised only where its liturgy had been, in the course of time, introduced.

J. L. LYNCH, O.S.F.

(To be continued.)

THE BLESSED EDMUND CAMPION'S "HISTORY OF IRELAND" AND ITS CRITICS.

WHILE the blessed Edmund Campion was compiling his *History of Ireland*, in 1571, he wrote a letter from Trowey, near Dublin, on the 19th March, to James Stanihurst, the worshipful Recorder of Dublin. In it he says:—

"Great is the fruit which I gather both from your affection and esteem; from your affection, that in these hard days you are as careful of me as if I had sprung, like Minerva from Jupiter, out of your head; from your esteem, because, when I was well-nigh turned out from house and home, you considered me worthy not only of your hospitality but of your love . . . It was your generosity and goodness to receive a stranger and foreigner into your house; to keep me all these months on the fat of the land; to look after my health as carefully as after that of your son Richard¹ who deserves all your love; to furnish me with all

¹ Richard was the father of two Jesuits, William and Peter Stanihurst.

conveniences of place, time, and company, as the occasion arose ; to supply me with books ; to make such provision for my time of study, that, away from my rooms at Oxford I never read more pleasantly. After this one would think there was nothing more to come. But there was more. As soon as you heard the first rustlings of the storm, which was sure to blow to a hurricane if I stayed longer in sight of the heretics at Dublin, you opened to me this secret hiding-place among your country friends. Till now I had to thank you for conveniences ; now I have to thank you for my safety and my breath. Yes, breath is the word ; for those who strive with the persecutors are commonly thrust into dismal dungeons, where they draw in filthy fogs, and are not allowed to breathe wholesome air. But now, through you and your children's kindness, I shall live, please God, more free from this peril, and, my mind tells me, most happily. First of all, your friend, Barnwall, is profuse in his promises. When he had read your letter he was sorry for the hardness of the times, but was as glad of my coming as if I had done him a great favour. As he had to go to Dublin, he commended me to his wife, who treated me most kindly. She is surely a very religious and modest woman. I was shut up in a convenient place within an inner chamber, where I was reconciled to my books. With these companions I lie concealed in my cell."

On the same day he wrote to Richard Stanihurst :—

"It is hard that, however grateful I feel, I cannot show it. But I know you neither need nor desire repayment ; so I only give you my wishes for the present ; the rest when I get back to the land of the living. Meanwhile, if these buried relics have any flavour of the old Campion, their flavour is for you ; they are at your service. I am infinitely obliged to you and your brother Walter for the pains you lately took on my behalf. Seriously, I owe you much. I have nothing to write about, unless you have time and inclination to laugh. Tell me—you say nothing. Listen, then. The day after I came here I sat down to read ; suddenly there broke into my chamber a poor old woman, who wanted to set things to rights ; she saw me on her left hand, and knowing nothing about me, she thought I was a ghost. Her hair stood on end, her colour fled, her jaw fell, she was struck dumb. 'What is the matter ?' I asked. Frightened to death she almost fainted ; she could not speak a word ; all she could do was to throw herself out of the room. She could not rest till she had told her mistress that there was some hideous thing, she thought a ghost, writing in the garret. The story was told at supper time, the old woman was sent for and made to tell her fright ; everybody died of laughing, and I proved to be alive and no ghost."¹

¹ Simpson's *Life of Edmund Campion*, page 39.

As Campion, while writing his *Irish History*, was taken for a *hideous thing* by the poor old woman, so, alas! that *History* has been held up as a hideous thing by learned and sober Irishmen from Dr. Keating,¹ in the seventeenth century, to Dr. Kelly² of Maynooth in our own times. For the last forty years I have often heard it spoken of, and always in terms of the severest censure, and during this Whitsuntide of 1891 I have heard it denounced by an Irish gentleman in presence of a learned Neapolitan who had lived a long time in America, and of an Englishman who had been educated at Oxford. It is sad that one, a blessed martyr, who should be so dear to all the children of the Catholic Church, is thus ignorantly and lightly misrepresented. Against such rash and unfounded statements I will produce the *History* to speak for itself; for as Stanihurst says, "Maister Campion did learn it to speak."

I. THE CRITICS.

Its first critic was Barnaby Rich, gent, the most bigoted and mendacious, perhaps, of all the English who have meddled with Irish history. In his descriptions of Ireland³ he says:—

"I think Ireland to be in nothing more unfortunate than in this, that her history was never undertaken to be truly set forth but by Papists such as Cambrensis, Campion, and Stanihurst. I need not describe this man, Campion, any further, for his end made trial of his honesty . . . These lying authorities engender ignorance, and nothing hath more led the Irish into error than the historiographers, chroniclers, bards and rhymers, who, at this day, do feed and delight them in speaking and writing with matter that flatters their ungracious humours."

Hence, according to Rich, Campion was a Papist and a Catholic martyr; and, therefore, a false witness who fed and delighted and flattered the ungracious humours of the Irish.

The learned Irish historian, Geoffry Keating, agrees with the Englishman in calling Campion a liar and a forger, but

¹ Preface to Keating's *History of Ireland*.

² In his edition of *Cambrensis eversus*, ii., page 364.

³ *Rare Books*, published between 1610 and 1624.

for the very opposite reason that he never praises the virtues of the Irish, but libels the whole country. Rich is "a lewd liar," beneath notice; but what are we to say of Keating, who mislaid his memory and his temper when speaking of our author? We must attribute the base and baseless statements he has written about the blessed Edmund Campion, not to malice, but to ignorance. This worthy man ends his preface¹ by saying: "Let the reader excuse me if I have chanced to go out of the way in anything I have said in this book; since, if there is anything reprehensible in it, it is not from malice it proceeds, but from ignorance (*aineolus*)."

We excuse him; but what "ignorance" he betrays in the following statements about Campion:—

"There is not an English historian who has treated of Ireland that did not endeavour to vilify and calumniate both the old English settlers and the Irish. Of this we have proof in the account of Cambrensis . . . Campion, and every other English writer who seem to imitate the beetle, which, when it raises its head in summer, flies about without stooping to the fragrant flowers or blossoms of the garden, even to the rose or lily, but bustles about, until at length it rolls and buries itself in the dung of some horse or cow, wherever it meets with it . . . They never think of the good and virtuous deeds of the old English or Irish nobility, or speak of their piety and valour; what monasteries they founded, what lands and endowments they have given to the Church, what immunities they granted to the ollamhs or learned doctors, their bounty to ecclesiastics, the relief they afforded to the orphans and the poor, their hospitalities to strangers . . . *Nothing of all this* is noticed by the English writers of the time . . . Whoever would undertake to make a short survey of the rude manners, and investigate the defects of the lower orders of the people, would easily fill a volume; for there is no country without its low rabble; yet the whole country is not to be libelled on that account. And since Mergsen, in speaking of the Irish, acted in this manner, I think it not just to esteem him as an historian; and of Campion I say the same.²

Now let us confront this with what Campion writes.
1. He says:—

"The Irish are religious, frank, sufferable of pains, infinite, very glorious, excellent horsemen, passing in hospitality,

¹ *Irish History*, page cxi., ed. Halliday.

² Keating, pp. ix., lxxiii.

wonderful, kind; such mirrors of holiness and austerity that other nations retain but a show or shadow of comparison of them; greedy of praise they are, and fearful of dishonour; they esteem their poets, and bountifully reward them; they tenderly love their foster-children, whereby they nourish a friendship so beneficial in every way. They are sharp-witted, lovers of learning, capable of any study, constant in labour, adventurous, kind-hearted; there is daily trial of good natures among them, to what rare gifts of grace and wisdom they do and have aspired. Clear men they are of skin and hue; their women are well-favoured, clear-coloured, big and large. They honour devout friars and pilgrims, suffer them to pass quietly, spare them and their mansions, whatever outrage they show to the country beside them; for the Irish are in no way outrageous against holy men,” &c.

2. He mentions the foundation of eleven monasteries or abbeys, one of which was established by *the good King of Ergall*; he tells how another man was a benefactor to every church and religious house twenty miles around him, and gave legacies to the poor and others; he praises James Butler for that of all vices he most abhorred the sin of the flesh, and in subduing the same gave notable example; he says that in the time of King John the mightiest Irish captains did stick together while their lives lasted, and for no manner of earthly thing slack the defence of their ancient liberty; he states that the Irish coursed the English into a narrow circuit, termed the Pale, out of which they durst not peep; he calls Birmingham a warrior incomparable; and so hanged was he, a knight among thousands odd and singular. He praises, exalts the virtues and the extraordinary charity to the poor, of even Shane O'Neill. Kildare was a mighty-made man, full of honour and courage; in government a mild man; to his enemies intractable, open; a warrior incomparable. Ormond was nothing inferior to him in stomach, and in reach of policy was far beyond him; of much moderation in speech; dangerous of every little wrinkle that touched his reputation. The Countess of Ormond, a sister of Kildare's, was a lady of such post that all the estates of the realm crouched unto her; so politic that nothing was thought substantially debated without her advice; manlike, and tall in stature, very rich and bountiful. He tells how the beautiful Irish striplings slew Turgesius and his guard, and that out flew the fame

thereof; and the Irish princes, nothing dull to catch hold of such advantage, with one assent rose ready to pursue their liberty, and with a running camp swept every corner of the land, razed the castles to the ground, and chased the strangers before them; slew all that abode the battle, and recovered, each man, his own precinct and former state of government. He tells how, in England, there was not a mean subject that dared extend his hand to fillip a peer of the realm; and that while Wolsely was begraced and belorded, and crouched and knelt unto, the Lord Deputy of Ireland found small grace with Irish borderers except he cut them off by the knees.¹

Therefore Keating's statements are absolutely untrue, as far as the blessed Edmund Campion is concerned. Hence he is accused of partiality towards the Irish by Barnaby Rich; and, indeed, in his descriptions, portraits, speeches, and other passages, he betrays such sympathy with the Catholic people of Ireland, and gives so many direct and indirect incentives to union, that if the English Attorney-General had got hold of his *History*, he would have put it in as evidence of treasonable practices, and, on that head alone, have got him condemned to lie, not on "a plank bed, but on the hurdle on which he was dragged to Tyburn to be hanged in his garment of Irish frieze."

I know that some readers will rub their eyes, and say: What! do you mean to say that Campion was not a reviler and calumniator of the Irish?² that he was not employed to revile them? that his hatred for them was not as intense and unnatural as that of Spencer?³ I mean to say and show all that. If he was employed by the English to revile Irishmen, why did his employers interrupt him in his work, and hunt him from place? If he hated the Irish, why did he praise their physical, moral, and intellectual characteristics more heartily than writer ever did before or since? He did not praise them blindly; but it is not true to say,

¹ See Campion's *History of Ireland*, ed. 1808.

² So D'Arcy M'Gee says.

³ So Dr. Kelly says.

with Simpson, Champion's unworthy English biographer, that "he descants upon what was then a national vice, now happily supplanted by the opposite virtue, the vice of impurity;" and it is not true to say, with Keating, that he libelled the nation at large. But it is true that all is not sunshine in his pages, and that the lights and shades are there distributed with real historic and artistic instinct. And for this he says:—

"I request you to deliver me from all undue and wrong suspicions, howsoever the privilege of a history hath tempered mine ink with sweet and sour ingredients. Verily, as touching the affairs and persons here deciphered, how little cause I have with any blind affection eitherways to be miscarried, themselves know best that here be noted yet living, and others by inquiring may conjecture. Farewell; from Drogheda, the 9th of June, 1571."

He mentions, certainly, some defects and vices of certain individuals or classes of Irishmen; but then, let us remember that on his trial for his life he said: "As in all Christian commonwealths, so in *England*, many vices and iniquities do abound; neither is there any realm so godly, no people so devout, nowhere so religious, but that in the same very places many enormities do flourish and evil men bear sway." But, supposing for a moment, that he dwells too much on the failings of our countrymen, it is not "Champion the Jesuit," "Champion the priest," or "Champion the Catholic," that is to blame for the penning of such things, and he is not responsible at all for the publication of them, as shall appear from the history of his *Historie*.

When he had finished his *History*, finding that he could hardly escape the English pursuivants long, and must endanger his friends, he resolved to return to England in disguise; and, under the name of Patrick, which he assumed out of devotion to the apostle of Ireland, he took ship at Drogheda, "apparelled in laquey's tweed" as servant of Melchior Hussey, the Earl of Kildare's steward, who was then on his way to England.

As there was some suspicion that he might be on board, some officers went to search the ship for him. As they

asked for him by name, he thought he could not escape, and his surprise was too great to allow him to take any precautions. So he stood quietly on the deck while the officers ferreted out every nook and corner, examined the crew, tumbled the cargo up and down, with plentiful curses on the seditious villain Campion. There he stood in his menial livery, and saw everybody but himself strictly examined; while he called devoutly on St. Patrick, whose name he had assumed, and whom, in consideration of the protection he then gave, he ever afterwards invoked in similar dangers. He escaped, but not his *History*. "*My History of Ireland*," he says, "I suspect has perished; it made a good-sized and neat volume; the heretical officers seized it."¹

Some months afterwards he was received into the Catholic Church at Douay, and three years after he entered the Society of Jesus at Rome. In 1577 he wrote from Prague to Father Coster, S.J., Provincial of the Rhenish Province:—

"*I was troubled about a parcel of manuscript, which is due to me from France, when Father Posserin told me it was possible you could lend me your aid in this business. I have ventured to ask you, relying on our relationship in Christ, which we have contracted in the society, to do what you can for me in this matter. Do you, my father, manage to have it sent to me at Prague—not by the shortest, but by the safest way. In anticipation, I profess myself much in your debt; for the book is a production of mine—not wholesome, because prematurely born; and if I am to lose it, I would rather it were altogether destroyed than fall into other hands.*"

He writes again to Father Coster in July, 1577:—

"I fully expected the assistance you promised me in your kind letter. . . . I enclose you a letter for Gregory Martin; if you can send to him into France, I hope he will do his part (*i.e.*, send the *History* to you for me). But, as Martin tells me² he knows no way of sending the papers to me, I beg you will take the whole business upon your shoulders, and manage to have them sent. But if this cannot be done, I will try some other plan, and give you no further trouble."

¹ Simpson, page 42.

² Was Martin afraid he would destroy this beautiful book?

In 1579 he writes again to Gregory Martin, still on the subject of his *History*:—

"I have left something for the end, *that you may know how much I have it at heart*. I had written to Father Coster our Provincial of the Rhenish Province, asking him if you sent him those writings of mine about Irish history, which you have to find some way of sending them to Prague in *perfect safety*. He promised . . . So now I ask you to get them to Cologne; our people will manage the rest."

In March, 1580, he left Prague, and went by Padua to Rome, which he reached in April, 1580. He left for England in April, and when his companions urged him to take the English name of Petre, to escape the English spies, "he, remembering how well he had escaped from Ireland under St. Patrick's patronage, would take no other but his old one of Patrick, albeit they tried to persuade him that the name, being Irish, might bring him in question."¹ When they arrived near Geneva, that sink of heresy, every man disguised himself; and Campion "dissembled his personage in the form of a poor Irishman dressed in an old suit of black buckram. In this guise, waiting with hat in hand, he stood "facing out this old doting heretical fool, Theodore Beza," and challenged him to a discussion.

At the very time that our author was so anxious to get his *History* into his own hands, and wished it to be destroyed rather than fall into other hands, Stanihurst wrote to Sir Henry Sydney:—

"There have been divers of late, that with no small toil, and great commendation, have thoroughly employed themselves in culling and packing together the scrapings and fragments of the history of Ireland. Among which crew, my fast friend and inward companion, Maister Edward Campion, did so learnedly bequite himself, as certes that his *History* in mitching wise wandered through sundry hands; and being therewithal, in certain places, somewhat tickle-tongued (for Maister Campion did learn it to speak), and in other places over spare, it twitiled more tales out of school, and drowned weightier matters in silence, than the author, *upon better view and longer search, would*

¹ *Life of Father Edmund Campion*, by Father Persons, his companion, the MS. of which is at Stonyhurst, and has been printed in his "Letters and Notices."

have permitted. I was fully resolved to enrich Maister Campion's chronicle with further additions ; but, weighing that my coarse pack-thread could not have become suitably knit with his fine silk, and what a disgrace it were hungerly to botch up a rich garment by clouting it with patches of sundry colours, I resolved not to borrow or steal aught to my purpose from his *History*."

Hollinshed was not so particular. In his address to Sydney he says :—

"Reginald Wolfe's hap was to light upon a copy of two books of Irish history, compiled by one¹ Edmund Campion, very well penned certainly, but so brief, that it were to be wished occasion had served him to have used more leisure, and thereby to have delivered to us a larger discourse. He had not past ten weeks' space to gather his matter, a very short time, doubtless, for such a work. I resolved to make shift to frame a special history of Ireland, following Campion's order, and setting down his own words, except where I had matter to enlarge out of other authors."

It is clear, then, that Campion cannot be held responsible for the published *History*, which may not represent his manuscript ; and if it did, Campion looked on his manuscript as unwholesome because prematurely born, and would rather it were altogether destroyed than fall into other hands, and, in consequence, he made every effort to get it, in order to destroy it, or to make it wholesome.

Even such as it is, it gives a graphic description of the Irishmen of his day, and as it is rare, some extracts from it will be honourable to Ireland, interesting to the reader, and also useful to clear away the merciless and unmerited censures of which this *History* has been the object for the last two hundred and fifty years.

I. CAMPION'S INTRODUCTION.

In dedicating his book to the Earl of Leicester, our author says to him :—

"That my travel into Ireland might seem neither causeless nor fruitless, I have thought it expedient . . . to yield you this poor book as an account of my poor voyage . . . more full of unsavoury toil for the time than any plot of work I ever

¹ Who was very well known and respected by Sydney.

attempted. It is well known to the learned of this land how late it was ere I could meet with Gerald of Wales, the only author that ministereth indifferent furniture to this chronicle; and with what search I have been driven to piece out the rest with the help of foreign writers (incidentally touching the realm), by a number of brief extracts of rolls, records, and scattered papers . . . so as to handle and lay these things together *I had not in all the space of ten weeks*. Such as it is, I address and bequeathe it to your good lordship, that by the patronage of this book you may be induced to weigh the estate and become a patron of this noble realm."

To the loving reader he writes:—

"I follow Giraldus Cambrensis,¹ who divideth his work into two parts. From the first, which is stuffed with much impertinent matter, I borrow so much as serveth the turn directly; the second I abridge into one chapter. . . . From 1370 to Henry the Eighth, because nothing is extant orderly written, I scramble forward with such records as could be sought up. From Henry the Eighth hitherto I took *instructions by mouth*. Whatsoever else I bring, besides these helps, either *mine own observation* hath found it, or some friend hath informed me, or common opinion hath received it, or I read it in a pamphlet. Notwithstanding, as naked and as simple as it is, it could never have grown to such proportion in such post-haste except I had entered into such familiar society and daily table-talk with the Worshipful Esquire, James Stanihurst, Recorder of Dublin. . . . Irish chronicles, *although they be reported*² to be full fraught of lewde examples, idle tales, and genealogies, 'et quicquid Græcia mendax audet in historia,' yet concerning the state of that wild people *specified before the conquest*,² I am persuaded,² that, with choice and judgment, I might have sucked thence *some better store*² of matter, and *gladly would have sought them*,² had I found an interpreter, or understood their tongue; the one, so rare that scarcely five in five hundred can skill thereof; the other, so hard that it asketh continuance in the land of more years than I had months to spare about this business. My special meaning was to gather so much as I thought the civil subjects would be content to read and withal to give a light to the learned antiquarians of this country birth . . ."

IRELAND.

"Ireland lieth aloof in the West ocean, and is deemed by the latter survey to be in length well-nigh three hundred miles north and south, broad from east to west, one hundred and

¹ A very bad guide; but he could find no other.

² Note the kindness and caution of these expressions.

twenty. In proportion it resembleth an egg,¹ blunt and plain on the sides, not reaching forth to sea, in nooks and elbows of land, as Britain doth. Dublin is the beauty and eye of Ireland, fast by a goodly river; the seat hereof is in many respects conformable, but less frequented of merchant strangers, because of the barred haven. Kilkenny is the best dry town in Ireland, on the south side of the river Suir; Galway is a proper neat city at the seaside. Waterford and Dungarvan are full of traffick with England, France, and Spain, by means of their excellent good havens.

"The soil is low and waterish, and includeth divers little islands environed with bogs and marches; the highest hills have standing pools in their top; the inhabitants, especially new come, are subject to distillation, rheumes and fluxes, for remedy whereof they used an ordinary drink of *aquavitæ*, so qualified in the making that it drieth more and inflameth less than other hot confections. The air is wholesome, not altogether so clear and subtle as ours of England. Of bees, good store; no vineyards, contrary to the opinion of some writers, who *both in this and other errors touching the land may easily be excused, as those that wrote of hearsay.*"²

"Cambrensis complaineth, that Ireland had excess of wood and very little champaign ground; but now the English Pale is too naked.³ Turf and seacoals are their most fuel. It is stored of kine, of excellent horses and hawks, of fish and fowl. They are not without wolves, and *greyhounds to hunt them bigger of bone and limb than a colt*. Their kine, as also their cattle, and commonly what else soever the country engendereth (*except man*)⁴ is much less in quantity than ours of England. Sheep few, and those bearing coarse fleeces, whereof they spin notable⁵ rug mantles. The country is very fruitful both of corn and grass; the grass for default of husbandry groweth so rank in the north part

¹ Its shape is that of a rhomboid, the great diagonal of which is 302 miles, and the less 210 miles; the greatest length on a meridional line is 225 miles; the greatest and least breadths or parallels of latitude, 174 and 111 miles.—*Thom's Directory*, page 619

² Some errors of his own we may easily excuse for the same reason.

³ He is the first to suggest re-afforesting; Spencer is accused by Lord Roche of cutting down the trees of his neighbours; see *infra*.

⁴ And dogs, of course, too. Giraldus Cambrensis had got it into his head, that all animals of Ireland, except men, were smaller than those of England. He says the Irish hare is smaller than the English. Perhaps it is, on an average, somewhat smaller; but certainly not to the extent that Giraldus represents. He describes it also, as given to take to cover like a fox, instead of taking to the country like the more sportsmanlike hare of England. I believe this to be a *libel*.—*Dimmick's* Preface to vol. v. of *Giraldus Cambrensis*, page lxxii.

⁵ He was himself hanged in an Irish rug.

that oft times it rotteth their kine.¹ Eagles are well known to breed here, but neither so big nor so many as books tell. Cambrensis reporteth of his own knowledge, and I have heard it averred by credible persons, that barnacles, thousands at once, are noted along the shores to hang by the beaks about the edges of putrified timber, ships, oars, anchor-holds, and such like, which, in process, taking lively heat of the sun, become water fowls, and at their ripeness fall into the sea or fly about into the air.

"Horses they have, of pace easy, and in running wonderful swift. Therefore, they make of them great store, as wherein at time of need they repose a great piece of safety. I heard it verified by Honourable to Honourable, that a nobleman offered, and was refused, for one such horse, an hundred kyne, five pound lands, and an eyrie of hawks yearly, for seven years.

"No venomous creeping beast is brought forth or nourished; or can live here, being sent in; and therefore, the spider of Ireland is well-known not to be venomous. St. Bede writeth, that serpents conveyed hither did presently die, being touched with the smell of the land, and that whatsoever came hence was there of sovereign virtue against poison. He exemplifieth in certain men stung with adders, who drank in water the scrapings of books that had been of Ireland, and were cured. Neither is this property to be ascribed to St. Patrick's blessing, as they commonly hold, but to the original blessing of God, who gave such nature to the situation and soil from the beginning. And *though I doubt not but it fared the better in many respects for that holy man's prayer,*² yet had it this condition notified hundreds of years ere he was born.

EDMUND HOGAN, S.J.

(To be continued.)

¹ Caused by the devastating inroads of the English, who spoiled and burnt all before them, in order to cause famine in the Irish territories. Our author did not know or dare to avow this.

² Spencer speaks most disrespectfully of St. Patrick, and attributes many of the ills of Ireland to his preaching and popery.

THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND.

THE conversion of England! We readily forgive a writer for being enthusiastic about it. It recalls volumes of history, free of the romance of hermits and saints, transcending in variety and absorbing interest the wildest flights of the imaginative writer, and the most inspiring theme of the poet. It recalls the grand old mellow days of Saxon and Norman Catholicism, when king's brothers were priests and their sisters nuns, when education was free, when saints were abundant, when faith and virtue ennobled the race, when knights and reeves and sheriffs and aldermen became monks; when warriors, who had tried their steel against the Danes, grasped their hilts, and swore to defend the abbot's rights, and invoked the destruction of St. Peter's sword on the violators thereof. It recalls the sanctity of Egbert, the courage of Wilfred, the learning of Alcuin. It brings back Bede and his monks; Hilda and her nuns; Canterbury, York, Lichfield, Durham, Winchester, historic names—an unbroken line from St. Augustine to William Warham, with here and there towering in the long line, Theodore and Dunstan and Lanfranc, and Anselm and à Becket, giants, *virī famosi a saeculo*—cathedrals, monuments of the faith, with their sanctuaries—Finchale, Fountains, Whalley, York and its Corpus Christi guild; Oxford in its palmy days, with its "Determinationes," legatine processions from Dover to London; cardinals and lord chancellors; and we dream a dream, and see in the future a people of thirty millions covering the same ground, with its thirty thousand priests and one hundred thousand nuns; and its religious orders, giving saints as of old; and the cross-tipped spire peeping among the trees in rural England, and the good old village parish priest; and the blessed Sacrament, in quiet possession of its own all over the bosom of this teeming land; and the Corpus Christi and May processions of old times; and our old men, with their white hair, saying their Hail Mary's by the wayside, waiting to be garnered in; and our young men, reverential and sound; and our young women,

light-hearted and blithe ; and our children, running to kiss the priest's hand ; and faith all over the land ; and peace and joy, and merry England once more, with the Holy Ghost enlightening with " silent streams " the heart of England, like a golden-rayed sunset on the horizon ! It is sunshine after rain. It is the conversion of England to the faith, after many generations of error, and despair, and gloom, and dismal deathbeds, when men went they knew not whither ; but, like the pagans, into darkness and night. That is a grand future—not reserved for our day, or the next. This generation shall not say, *Quia viderunt oculi mei salutare tuum*. Shall the next ?

But you may object, England will never return to the true faith. It is against the analogy of history. No nation in the whole course of history that fell ever came back to the faith again. The East fell, and never returned ; Egypt fell, and never recovered ; Carthage and all the North African Churches fell, and never returned ; Germany fell, and never returned ; Scandinavia fell, and never returned ; Scotland fell, and never returned ; and do you expect that England, whose fall began and grew on lower passions and more selfish motives than influenced some of the others—lust and avarice—will get a grace hitherto refused to all the rest ? The Donatists died in their heresy ; the Eutychians died in their heresy ; the Nestorians died in their heresy ; the Photians died in their heresy ; their descendants, the Greeks and Russians, do the same. Scotch Presbyterians, German Lutherans, Norwegian Calvinists, Russian schismatics, African Mahomedans, and English Protestants, go the way of all flesh. Lavigerie dreams about the Africans, Tondini about the Russians, and you, gentlemen, dream about the Church of England becoming once more united to the See of Peter. We wish we could share with you in the pleasure of the dream ; but England is dead, and, like the nations that went before, from Israel downwards, there is no resurrection.

We must say that we have a strong aversion to the objection. It would damp energy, frustrate plans, and utterly demoralize the missionary ideal. So, as we are not inclined to grapple with it, we pass it by. *Non ragionam' di lor'*.

There are two forces at work regarding the Catholicism of the country. It will throw light on the purpose of the present paper to indicate them. One is inside the Church, and the other outside it; one Catholic, the other Protestant, though Catholicizing. The Ritualists, and the Ritualists alone, are doing all that is being done among Protestants. How many parsons from Newman to Rivington have been converted by priests? True, all have been *received* by priests. But how many have confessed their obligations to our sermons or our writings that we Catholic priests were in any degree answerable for their conversion? The Catholicizing movement in the Establishment has not been the result of the missionary activity of the Catholic Church in England. It is true to say that convert priests receive more converts than others, but that is mainly on account of personal influence in certain non-Catholic quarters where we have no access, as well as having a keener grasp of difficulties which we never feel. Men who pass through the fire themselves are good guides. This external movement is of vast importance. At this hour five thousand Church of England clergymen are preaching from as many Protestant pulpits the Catholic faith (not, indeed, as faith) to Catholicizing congregations, much more effectively, with less suspicion and more acceptance than we can ever hope to do. Protestant sisterhoods are doing, we feel sure, the best they can under the circumstances to familiarize the Philistine with nuns—and that is much. Protestant societies, like St. Margaret's, Westminster, furnish poor country missions (there *are* poor country Protestant missions, and city ones too) with black vestments for requiems on All Souls. This is, indeed, a matter for devout thankfulness. We could desire no better preparation for joining the Catholic Church than the Ritualists' preparatory school; and the fact that from them we have secured the majority of our converts, strengthens us in our view of it.

But, in spite of all this, and in spite of many high hopes that have prevailed and still prevail amongst us, we think it well to say that for us in our present position, the vital question for us is—not the conversion of Protestants, but

alas! let us say it, the conversion of Catholics. Let us solidify our parochial institutions; let us purify family life; let us build upon the natural and legitimate development of Catholic families. St. Paul had some special ideas about "the household of the faith." A short time ago in the pages of the I. E. RECORD we ventured to urge the primary importance of renewing the wholesome discipline of the Church in the matter of marriages and burials. We hold that they are of grave importance in building up the Catholic Church in England. As for marriages, they being the source of all our woes, the rehabilitation of Christian marriage seems to be absolutely essential to our progress. What can we expect from bad marriages but bad families? Here is an experienced priest who tells me that he has married in his time some two hundred and eighty couples, and out of these he could count some twenty really Christian marriages which were entitled to the blessing of God. Two hundred and sixty were the usual kind of things which we get accustomed to, and which we call marriages, because they come to the church, and the priest and registrar put them through the usual ceremony. Lacordaire says much in his conference *La Famille* about the beauty of a marriage, and youth, beauty, innocence, and kindred charming things; but Lacordaire never worked a city mission in London, or Manchester, or Liverpool.

But not only in this regard do we notice a fatal weakness in the fibre of Catholicism in England. Take our Sunday masses. Catholics are bound to go to mass, but (all reasons aside) do they go? Here is a parish of four thousand—a well-worked, well-manned parish, and one thousand seven hundred go to mass. There is another with a Catholic population of close on seven thousand, and three thousand go to mass. And these are very high attendances; higher than are generally secured. Indeed there is hardly any doubt whatever that in this great centre of the North, where we have so much really energetic Catholicism, nearly twenty thousand Catholics habitually lose mass. And for it there is no remedy except to keep pegging away. The present writer once took in hand a famous street in his district;

it contained an adult Catholic population of ninety-four, all bound to hear mass, and all lost mass habitually. We visited them for sixteen weeks, and thus every person there received sixteen visits, making a total of one thousand five hundred and four visits paid in that street. Slowly, gently, patiently, we spoke, exhorted, and rebuked, in *omni patientia et doctrina*. We were resolved to win: one thousand five hundred and four promises were given and broken. One woman came to confession, and never went to mass or confession since, and that is four years ago. We remember two families whose bedrooms overlooked the church, and over the organ-gallery the people could see out of their beds the lights on the altar and the priest saying mass. We went there regularly Sunday after Sunday to rouse them up to come to the 10.15 or the 11 o'clock mass. We asked them to look out, and see the priest saying mass; they never turned their heads in bed; and they finally left because the priest was making himself such a nuisance! Now, let us say this deliberately, their faith is gone; after three centuries of suffering and buffeting by the storm they sink in a calm sea, like those birds that traverse the ocean, and plunge into the wave in sight of land. Of all the hopeless cases where the priest gets nothing for his labour, these Catholics seems to be most hopeless, and all the priest can say is: "*Misereatur Dominus, misereatur nostri, et illuminet vultum suum super nos.*" They shall come from all parts, the East and the West, and sit down in the bosom of Abraham; but, indeed, not these. St. Paul had no hesitation in saying: "*Ecce convertimur ad gentes,*" when his ministry was refused; and it will strike many priests that it is easier to Catholicize well-disposed Protestant families in his district than get Catholics of this type to mass.

This is, indeed, a lamentable condition, and opens the door to many grave abuses. Can we progress under such circumstances? Are we progressing? Some say, Yes; some, No. A priest lately said that this grumbling at the so-called unsatisfactory condition of Catholicism in the country is enough to bring down on us the chastisement of the Almighty, and that nothing strikes him more than the

miraculous progress which we have made during the past generation or so.

Let us see how far statistics go. Somebody has said that we ought to be nearly 4,000,000. Let us say that we know of no data that would warrant such a figure.

In 1841 the Catholic population of England and Wales was 800,000. Since then the total population of England has increased 62 per cent. In 1841 it was 18,845,424; now it is 30,537,275. The Irish famine sent (approximately) 750,000, and *their* natural development would be (approximately) 280,000. Totting up we find:—

Catholic population in 1841 . . .	800,000
Increase at 62 per cent. . . .	500,000
Exiled by famine	750,000
Their increase	280,000

What we ought to be 2,330,000

On reviewing the most reliable figures for our actual population, we find in round numbers that the actual Catholic total is about 1,362,760. Our marriage returns issued to the Registrar-General bears out that figure, and for our purpose it is sufficiently accurate.

Now, 2,330,000—1,362,760 = 967,240, or a deficit of close of a million Catholics. Now, we ask, where is that million? Can we be fairly accused of murmuring against the providence of God if we complain that we cannot view figures like these with complacency? We could wish that emigration transferred them to the Catholic Church of the United States, and that that prosperous community was enriched at our expense rather than be driven to the conclusion that they lost the faith. We believe emigration accounts for some; but we have no doubt that the heavy end has simply lost the faith. We know a country village growing around the works of a German Lutheran (Sir Salis Schwabe) and no Catholic family goes into it without losing the faith. Poor Catholic families come from Ireland who know the faith traditionally, but not polemically, who were never prepared to emigrate, and who never should be allowed to emigrate and settle down. They have the British schools and skeleton

evangelicalism bitter as aloes against the faith ; no mass, no Catholic schools within miles, no priest, but a white-chokered gentleman professing whatever kind of heresy the patron advertises for—generally, we believe, something about essential corruption and compulsory damnation. The priest is kept out. The game is all on the one side, and in twelve months the Mullens and Mulligans and Murphys have lost the faith. This, we fear, prevails to a considerable extent in rural districts ; but as we desire to write with caution, we would recommend more general information before attempting to suggest a percentage.

It is not difficult to find out what is going on as regards loss of faith in a city mission. It is considerably more difficult, at least under present circumstances, to cope with it. Educationalists may inquire where are our children, in a tone that does not suggest that they want them in Catholic schools. It is well worth our while to inquire, where are our people married, and to whom. Opening the register of an average Protestant parochial church, I read as follows :—

MARRIAGES.

- February 19—Edwin Walton to Sarah Whittaker.
 „ 27—Frank Watson to Elizabeth Parker.
 „ 27—*John Dooly* to Mary Ann Atkinson.
 „ 28—*Thomas Tiernan* to Elizabeth Duff.
 March ——*John Powell* to Edith Taylor.
 „ 4—Alfred Plummer Boulton to *Mary Ellen Lyons*.
 „ 11—Thomas Smith to Sarah Stafford.
 „ 20—James Henry Coates to Matilda Paulden
 Newton.
 April 1—Edward John Wellings to *Mary Josephine O'Hara*.
 „ 2—Joseph Hinds to Annie Florence Taylor.
 „ 4—Charles Milner Nesbitt to *Mary Jane Riley*.
 „ 15—Thomas Jones to Elizabeth Barlow.
 „ 16—James Herbert Kenyon to Elizabeth Ann Jones.

And so the lists go on until we come to November, the last notice being fairly in keeping with the preceding, viz. :—

- Nov. 12—Richard Jackson to Jane Nicholson Haere.
 „ 12—Conrad William Warmbold to *Winefred Brannan*.
 „ 12—William Breakey to *Catherine Annie Duffy*.
 „ 21—Horatio Robert Goodwin to Mary Dunstone.
 „ 27—Thomas Sharp to *Mary Anne Kelly*.

I have italicized the names obviously Irish: I have omitted English names, which, for all I know, *may* be Catholic. Whatever way we view it, is not the list interesting? Is not the percentage high? and can it be in accordance with the designs of the Almighty in such a way as to merit His vengeance by grumbling about it? It all comes from that wonderful discretion which we have succeeded in practising so long that it is now a widespread conspiracy of silence. The writer once preached at a Missa Cantata (*parochus celebrante*) on the sanctity of marriage, its sacramental character, *a sacramentum vivorum*; a marriage before the registrar, *a sacrilege*; a mixed marriage and a marriage in a Protestant Church, *a communicatio in sacris* and an implicit adhesion to heresy, &c. The Gospel was on the marriage feast of Cana of Galilee, and (as we presumed) naturally formed a legitimate and time-honoured starting-point. As the parochus will read this, let us say that he was very unhappy during that half-hour, and when it was over, and he was free to make an observation, he said:—"Well, I never yet had a curate that did not insist on preaching a sermon on the marriage feast of Cana in Galilee." We violated the circumspect conspiracy of silence, but as we took particular pains in preparing the sermon, we ought to be allowed the luxury of relating the anecdote.

Now, in connection with these registers, let us note that, in the long run, the number of girls who marry non-Catholics in the Protestant church is largely in excess of the number of Catholic young men who go there to contract marriage with non-Catholic young women. We suspect that the young man has generally the *voluntas praeordinans* in matters of this kind. The result is, that in a large number of cases where the Irish and Catholic young woman (*v. g.*, Mary Jane Riley is married to Charles Milner Nesbitt) with the Irish and Catholic name appears before the next priest as Mrs. Milner Nesbitt, the rev. gentleman takes her for a Protestant, and she disappears finally from the purview of any priest. When you keep this fact steadily in view, you will find an explanation that goes a long way in solving the difficulty arising from the comparative fewness of the

baptisms with ostensibly Catholic names. Thus, if you find William Henry Riley in a Protestant register of baptisms, you begin to suspect that something is wrong; but finding William Henry Nesbitt, you conclude he is English and Protestant, and that the Protestant register is the proper place for him to be. We baptize a certain number, of which a large number are again put through the ceremony in the Protestant church. Our baptism, however, is no guarantee that they will be brought up Catholics. It is a guarantee that they have really been baptized, and that there is a hope—*sacramenta propter homines* is a holy principle to which we cling—that they may be Catholics. Still, of these a large number is baptized in the Protestant church and nowhere else, a not inconsiderable number is never baptized anywhere, and of all these the vast majority are never heard of again in connection with any congregation, Catholic or Protestant. We do not frequently hear of them dying Protestants, because we never hear of them dying anything at all. Still an odd name appears on the scanty list of those sufficiently Protestant to be put on the mortuary list in the register—those who presumably sent for the rector in their sickness, and died Protestants—and these are a mere fraction of the Protestant community. For instance, we read with sadness the death of the following “Protestant” :—

“ Ann Kelly. Aged 80.”

Poor Ann! No confession, no Confiteor rolling on in the Irish tongue, no God-visited deathbed in the Holy Viaticum, no signing of this sinful flesh of ours with the holy oils! No; a struggle in the hurricane in the night, and—Ann Kelly, aged 80, dies a Protestant.

From this we gather that a large number of Catholics are married in the Protestant church—a large number of their children are baptized there, and are not heard of any more, and some are heard of figuring on the list of Protestant deaths. This is not cheerful. How far will it go to account for our deficit of one million souls? The genesis of this great running sore may be this. Prior to 1837 Catholics

were bound to present themselves in the Protestant church, and be put through the form before the minister. Of course, our people were told to distinguish between the civil and the religious part of the function. But the bucolic mind will not distinguish. It grasps salient points, and the salient point caught was the palpable fact that the priests gave consent to a matrimonial function before the minister in the Protestant church.

This was clearly paring away a good deal of the hoofs of Antichrist. When the Act of Parliament was changed in 1837, the remembrance of this continued, and although mixed marriages were denounced, still the popular mind of Catholics thought that what was right then would not be so absolutely iniquitous now, and so it continued to be looked upon as not so bad after all. And if the marriage of Catholics, as they thought, was not so great a crime, still less must it be when the girl, *v.g.*, is a Protestant, to marry her in the Protestant church. And then they discover (they invariably discover the wrong thing) that we objure them not so much for marrying a Protestant girl as for marrying her before the Protestant minister. So they conclude that they are doing something tolerably good by mending their ways and marrying her in the Catholic church. Hence we arrive at the idea that a mixed marriage when celebrated by the priest (with a dispensation which they speak of as a permission to be granted for the asking, and worse still which we are quite willing to grant, as we never refuse) is part and parcel of the average working of the Church, and that it is very hard that they are opposed in doing what all their acquaintances who wanted to do it did, and that without let or hindrance. Hence it comes that the Catholic popular conscience is all awry and askew, and people would only wonder at the commotion we would make if we denounced it, which we do not. So we content ourselves with blandly deprecating it for a moment and then yielding; and when we tot up we find a clear loss of 1,000,000 souls, which we are assured is wonderful and miraculous prosperity, and *mirabilis est Deus in operibus suis*, especially here.

Now how are we to deal with an evil of such magnitude?

It is now simply a question of holding our own people. Remember, even now, we are the most numerous denomination in the country after the Church of England. If we had all our own people around us, the Catholic Church in England would be the most conspicuous and powerful body in the land. For unity of purpose, for independence of action, for earnestness and perseverance, and loyalty to our cause, we shall always be unequalled. Our people can always be rallied; and when we poll our full strength the community at large will be quite prepared to admit how powerful we really are. Nothing succeeds like success. If you succeed, you are right. Hardly any argument tells so well here in your favour as when you show that the great public cannot afford to despise you. If you have power and strength and importance, and the prestige that springs from these attributes, all your arguments will be entertained, and all will be well. A nation must be taken according to its temper; and the temper of England is opposed to Uriah Heeps and his "'umble home." Now what is necessary to make Catholicism strong in England? To keep our own people. The first step towards the conversion of England is to build up our own people. If we shall be unable to secure a greater measure of success with our own flocks in the very near future than we have obtained, there will be very little use in going further afield to appeal to the public conscience of the country to embrace the Catholic faith.

How shall we attempt this task? Looking over the country we find various missionary units. First, the province, with its metropolitan and suffragans. Then comes the individual diocese, with its ordinary; then the parish; then the district. Hence arise a hierarchy of missionary work. The progress of Catholicism in the country depends on the efficiency of the missionary labour of each diocese. The diocese depends on parochial perfection, and the latter on the character and efficiency of district work. In this way the proficiency of district work, and the progress and strength of Catholicism in the district are the measure of the progress of the conversion of the whole country. That is obvious. But what is the result? That the great brunt of the battle

must be borne by the junior clergy. The strength of Catholicism throughout the country depends on the hold which a priest has on his district; and we are not merely thinking of the Catholic population now, but of the whole mixed community in the midst of which he is planted. His local influence is the main power of the Church. His knowledge of local needs, and how best they can be most efficiently met, is the sum total of Catholic strategy on the ground where he stands. If we keep merely the Catholic element before our minds, the missionary who knows his people and can call them by name, is he who needs the greatest influence for the good of the Church; and as for the Protestants, especially those belonging to the industrial classes, the more they know the priest, and the more he knows them, the more their hostility wherever it exists will be neutralized, and thus a great obstacle to Catholic progress will be removed, and the more he will have pity on the poor starving multitude of people who never sinned against the light of Catholic truth, who were born in the wilderness, and who will die in it if the priest passes them by. But, of course, our first duty is towards our own; a duty, be it said, in no way hostile to the claims of those outside the Church. It is small comfort to know that many Protestants are accessible; while, on the other hand, we are confronted with a colossal deficit in our own ranks, for which we cannot account. The conversion of England will, we fear, remain as it is, unless we can shepherd our own people, and gather the "remnants" of Israel from the Syrians and Egyptians.

JOSEPH TYNAN.

Document.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII.
“DE CONDITIONE OPIFICUM.”

(*Continued.*)

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE
XIII. LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES
ARCHIEPISCOPOS ET EPISCOPOS UNIVERSOS CATHOLICI ORBIS
GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

DE CONDITIONE OPIFICUM.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIS
ET EPISCOPIS UNIVERSIS CATHOLICI ORBIS GRATIAM ET COM-
MUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Confidenter ad argumentum aggredimur ac plane iure Nostro, propterea quod caussa agitur ea, cuius exitus probabilis quidem nullus, nisi advocata religione Ecclesiasque, reperietur. Cum vero et religionis custodia, et earum rerum, quae in Ecclesiae potestate sunt, penes Nos potissimum dispensatio sit neglexisse officium tactiturnitate videremur. Profecto aliorum quoque operam et contentionem tanta haec caussa desiderat : principum reipublicae intelligimus, dominorum ac locupletium, denique ipsorum, pro quibus contentio est, proletariorum : illud tamen sine dubitatione affirmamus, inania conata hominum futura, Ecclesia posthabita. Videlicet Ecclesia est, quae promittit ex Evangelio doctrinas, quarum virtute aut plane componi certamen potest, aut certe fieri, detracta asperitate, mollius ; eademque est, quae non instruere mentem tantummodo, sed regere vitam et mores singulorum praeceptis suis contendit ; quae statum ipsum proletariorum ad meliora promovit pluribus utilissime institutis ; quae vult atque expetit omnium ordinum consilia viresque in id consociari, ut opificum rationibus, quam commodissime potest, consulatur ; ad eamque rem adhiberi leges ipsas auctoritatemque reipublicae, utique ratione ac modo, putat oportere.

Illud itaque statuatur primo loco, ferendam esse conditionem humanam ; ima summis paria fieri in civili societate non posse,

Agitant id quidem *Socialistae* : sed omnis est contra rerum naturam vanâ contentio. Sunt enim in hominibus maximae plurimaeque natura dissimilitudines : non omnium paria ingenia sunt, non sollertia, non valetudo, non vires ; quarum rerum necessarium discrimen sua sponte sequitur fortuna dispar. Idque plane ad usus tum privatorum tum communitatis accomodate ; indiget enim varia ad res gerendas facultate diversisque muneribus vita communis ; ad quae fungenda munera potissimum impelluntur homines differentia rei cuiusque familiaris. Et ad corporis laborem quod attinet, in ipso *statu innocentiae* non iners omnino erat homo futurus ; at vero quod ad animi delectationem tunc libere optavisset voluntas, idem postea in expiationem culpae subire non sine molestiae sensu coegit necessitas. *Maledicta terra in opere tuo : in laboribus comedes ex ea cunctis diebus vitae tuae.*¹ Similique modo finis acerbitatum reliquarum in terris nullus est futurus, quia mala peccati consecraria aspera ad tolerandum sunt, dura difficilia : eaque homini usque ad ultimum vitae comitari est necesse. Itaque pati et perpeti humanum est, et ut homines experiantur ac tentent omnia, istiusmodi incommoda evellere ab humano convictu penitus nulla vi, nulla arte poterunt. Siqui id se profiteantur posse, si miserae plebi vitam polliceantur omni dolore molestiaque vacantem, et refertam quiete ac perpetuis voluptatibus, illi populo imponunt fraudemque struunt, in mala aliquando erupturam maiora praesentibus. Optimum factu res humanas, ut se habent, ita contueri, simulque opportunum incommodis levamentum uti diximus, aliunde petere.

Est illud in caussa, de qua dicimus, capitale malum, opinione fingere alterum ordinem sua sponte infensum alteri, quasi locupletes et proletarios ad digladiandum inter se pertinaci duello natura comparaverit. Quod adeo a ratione abhorret et a veritate, ut contra verissimum sit, quo modo in corpore diversa inter se membra conveniunt, unde illud existit temperamentum habitudinis, quam symmetriam recte dixeris, eodem modo naturam in civitate praecepisse ut geminae illae classes congruant inter se concorditer, sibi que convenienter ad aequilibratam respondeant. Omnino altera alterius indiget : non res sine opera, nec sine re potest opera consistere. Concordia gignit pulcritudinem rerum atque ordinem ; contra ex perpetuitate certaminis oriatur necesse est cum agresti immanitate confusio. Nunc vero ad dirimendum certamen, ipsasque eius radices amputandas, mira vis est institu-

¹Gen. iii. 17.

torum christianorum, eaque multiplex. Ac primum tota disciplina religionis, cuius est interpres et custos Ecclesia, magnopere potest locupletes et proletarios componere invicem et coniungere, scilicet utroque ordine ad officia mutua revocando, in primisque ad ea quae a iustitia ducuntur. Quibus ex officiis illa proletarium atque opificem attingunt; quod libere et cum aequitate pactum operae sit, id integre et fideliter reddere: non rei ullo modo nocere, non personam violare dominorum: in ipsis tuendis rationibus suis abstinere a vi, nec seditionem induere unquam: nec commisceri cum hominibus flagitiosis, immodicas spes et promissa ingentia artificiose iactantibus, quod fere habet poenitentiam inutilem et fortunarum ruinas consequentes. Ista vero ad divites spectant ac dominos: non habendos mancipiorum loco opifices: vereri in eis aequum esse dignitatem personae, utique nobilitatam ab eo, character christianus qui dicitur. Quaestuosas artes, si naturae ratio, si christiana philosophia audiat, non pudori homini esse, sed decori, quia vitae sustentandae praebent honestam potestatem. Illud vere turpe et inhumanum, abuti hominibus pro rebus ad quaestum, nec facere eos pluris, quam quantum nervis polleant viribusque. Similiter praecipitur, religionis et bonorum animi haberi rationem in proletariis oportere. Quare dominorum partes esse, efficere ut idoneo temporis spatio pietate vacet opifex; non hominem dare obvium lenociniis corruptelarum illecebrisque peccandi: neque ullo pacto a cura domestica parsimoniaeque studio abducere. Item non plus imponere operis, quam vires ferre queant, nec id genus, quod cum aetate sexuque dissideat. In maximis autem officiis dominorum illud eminet, iusta unicuique praebere. Profecto ut mercedis statuatur ex aequitate modus, caussae sunt considerandae plures: sed generatim locupletes atque heri meminerint, premere emolumentum sui causa indigentes ac miseros, alienaque ex inopia captare quaestum, non divina, non humana, iura sinere. Fraudare vero quemquam mercede debita grande piaculum est, quod iras e caelo ultrices clamore devocat. *Ecce merces operariorum . . . quae fraudata est a vobis, clamat: et clamor eorum in aures Domini Sabaoth introivit.*¹ Postremo religiose cavendum locupletibus ne proletariorum compendiis quicquam noceant nec vi, nec dolo, nec funebribus artibus: idque eo vel magis quod non satis illi sunt contra iniurias atque impotentiam muniti, eorumque res, quo exilior, hoc sanctior habenda.

¹ Iac. v. 4.

His obtemperatio legibus nonne posset vim caussasque dissidii vel sola restringere? Sed Ecclesia tamen, Iesu Christo magistro et duce, persequitur maiora: videlicet perfectius quidam praeci-
piendo, illuc spectat, ut alterum ordinem vicinitate proxima
amicitiaque alteri coniungat. Intelligere atque aestimare mor-
talia ex veritate non possumus, nisi dispexerit animus vitam
alteram eamque immortalem: qua quidem dempta, continuo
forma ac vera notio honesti interiret: immo tota haec rerum
universitas in arcanum abiret nulli hominum investigationi
pervium. Igitur, quod natura ipsa admonente didicimus, idem
dogma est christianum, quo ratio et constitutio tota religionis
tamquam fundamento principe nititur, cum ex hac vita exces-
serimus, tum vere non esse victuros. Neque enim Deus hominem
ad haec fragilia et caduca, sed ad caelestia atque aeterna gene-
ravit, terramque nobis ut exulandi locum, non ut sedem habi-
tandi dedit. Divitiis ceterisque rebus, quae appellantur bona,
affluas, careas, ad aeternam beatitudinem nihil interest: quemad-
modum utare, id vero maxime interest. Acerbitates varias,
quibus vita mortalis fere contextitur Iesus Christus *copiosa redemp-
tione* sua nequaquam sustulit, sed in virtutum incitamenta,
materiamque bene merendi traduxit: ita plane ut nemo morta-
lium queat praemia sempiterna capessere, nisi cruentis Iesu
Christi vestigiis ingrediatur. *Si sustinebimus, et conregnabimus*.¹
Laboribus ille et cruciatibus sponte susceptis, cruciatuum et
laborem mirifice vim delenivit: nec solum exemplo, sed gratia
sua perpetuaeque mercedis spe proposita, perpersionem dolorum
effecit faciliorem: *id enim, quod in praesenti est momentaneum et
leve tribulationis nostrae, supra modum in sublimitate aeternum
gloriae pondus operatur in nobis*.²

Itaque fortunati monentur, non vacuitatem doloris afferre, nec
ad felicitatem aevi sempiterni quicquam prodesse divitias sed
potius obesse; ³ terrori locupletibus esse debere Iesu Christi
insuetas minas; ⁴ rationem de usu fortunarum Deo iudici
severissime aliquando reddendam. De ipsis opibus utendis excel-
lens ac maximi momenti doctrina est quam si philosophia inco-
hatam, at Ecclesia tradidit perfectam plane, eademque efficit ut
non cognitione tantum, sed moribus teneatur. Cuius doctrinae
in eo est fundamentum positum, quod iusta possessio pecuniarum
a iusto pecuniarum usu distinguitur. Bona privatim possidere,

¹ 2 ad Tim. ii, 12.² 2 Cor. iv. 17.³ Matth. xix, 23, 24.⁴ Luc. vi. 24, 25

quod paulo ante vidimus, ius est homini naturale : eoque uti iure, maxime in societate vitae, non fas modo est, sed plane necessarium. *Licitum est, quod homo propria possideat. Et est etiam necessarium ad humanam vitam.*¹ At vero si illud quaeratur, qualem esse usum bonorum necesse sit, Ecclesia quidem sine ulla dubitatione respondet : *quantum ad hoc non debet homo habere res exteriores ut proprias, sed ut communes, ut scilicet de facili aliquis eas communicet in necessitate aliorum. Unde Apostolus dicit : divitibus huius saeculi praecipe . . . facile tribuere, communicare.*² Nemo certe opitulari aliis de eo iubetur, quod ad usus pertineat cum suos tum suorum necessarios : immo nec tradere aliis quo ipse egeat ad id servandum quod personae conveniat, quodque deceat : *nullus enim inconvenienter vivere debet.*³ Sed ubi necessitati satis et decoro datum, officium est de eo quod superat gratificari indigentibus. *Quod superest, date eleemosynam.*⁴ Non iustitiae, excepto in rebus extremis, officia ista sunt, sed caritatis christianae, quam profecto lege agendo petere ius non est. Sed legibus iudiciisque hominum lex antecedit iudiciumque Christi Dei, qui multis modis suadet consuetudinem largiendi ; *beatius est magis dare, quam accipere :*⁵ et collatam negatamve pauperibus beneficentiam perinde est ac sibi collatam negatamve iudicaturus. *Quamdiu fecistis uni ex his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis.*⁶ Quarum rerum haec summa est ; quicumque maiorem copiam bonorum Dei munere accepit, sive corporis et externa sint, sive animi, ob hanc causam accepisse, ut ad perfectionem sui pariterque, velut minister providentiae divinae, ad utilitates adhibeat ceterorum. *Habens ergo talentum, curet omnino ne taceat : habens rerum affluentiam, vigilet ne a misericordiae largitate torpescat : habens artem qua regitur, magnopere studeat ut usum atque utilitatem illius cum proximo partiatur.*⁷

Bonis autem fortunae qui careant, ii ab Ecclesia perdocentur, non probro haberi, Deo iudice, paupertatem, nec eo pudendum, quod victus labore quaeratur. Idque confirmavit re et facto Christus Dominus, qui pro salute hominum *egenus factus est, cum esset dives ;*⁸ cumque esset filius Dei ac Deus ipsemet, videri tamen ac putari fabri filius voluit : quin etiam magnam vitae partem in opere fabrili consumere non recusavit. *Nonne hic est faber,*

¹ II-II Quaest. lxvi. a. ii.⁵ Actor. xx. 35.² II-II Quaest. lxv. a. ii.⁶ Matth. xxv. 40.³ II-II Quaest. xxxii. a. vi.⁷ S. Greg. Magn. in Evang. Hom. ix. n. 7.⁴ Luc. xi. 41.⁸ 2 Corinth. viii. 9.

filius Mariae ?¹ Huius divinitatem exempli intuentibus, ea facilius intelliguntur : veram hominis dignitatem atque excellentiam in moribus esse, hoc est in virtute, positam ; virtutem vero commune mortalibus patrimonium, imis et summis, divitibus et proletariis aequè parabile : nec aliud quippiam quam virtutes et merita, in quocumque reperiantur, mercedem beatitudinis aeternae sequuturum. Immo vero in calamitosorum genus propensior Dei ipsius videtur voluntas ; beatos enim Iesus Christus nuncupat pauperes² ;² invitat peramanter ad se, solatii caussa, quicumque in labore sint ac luctu :³ infimos et iniuria vexatos complectitur caritate⁴ ; praecipua. Quarum cognitione rerum facile in fortunatis deprimitur tumens animus, in aerumnosis demissus extollitur : alteri ad facilitatem, alteri ad modestiam flectuntur. Sic eupitum superbiae intervallum efficitur brevius, nec difficulter impetrabitur ut ordinis utriusque, iunctis amice dextris, copulentur voluntates.

Quos tamen, si christianis praeceptis paruerint, parum est amicitia, amor etiam fraternus inter se coniugabit. Sentient enim et intelligent, omnes plane homines a communi parente Deo procreatos : omnes ad eumden finem bonorum tendere, qui Deus est ipse, qui afficere beatitudine perfecta atque absoluta et homines et Angelos unus potest : singulos item pariter esse Iesu Christi beneficio redemptos et in dignitatem filiorum Dei vindicatos, ut plane necessitudine fraterna cum inter se tum etiam cum Christo Domino, *primogenito in multis fratribus*, contineantur. Item naturae bona, munera gratiae divinae pertinere communiter et promiscue ad genus hominum universum, nec quemquam, nisi indignum, bonorum caelestium fieri exheredem. *Si autem filii, et heredes : heredes quidem Dei, coheredes autem Christi.*⁴

Talis est forma officiorum ac iurium, quam christiana philosophia profitetur. Nonne quieturum perbreve tempore certamen omne videatur, ubi illa in civili convietu valeret ?

Denique nec satis habet Ecclesia via inveniendae curationis ostendere, sed admovet sua manu medicinam. Nam tota in eo est ut ad disciplinam doctrinamque suam excolat homines atque

¹ Marc. vi. 3.

² Matth. v. 3 : *Beati pauperes spiritu.*

³ Matth. xi. 28 ; *Venite ad me omnes, qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos.*

⁴ Rom. viii. 17.

instituat: cuius doctrinae saluberrimos rivos, Episcoporum et Cleri opera, quam latissime potest, curat deducendos. Deinde pervadere in animos nititur flectereque voluntates, ut divinorum disciplina praeceptorum regi se gubernarique patiantur. Atque in hac parte, quae princeps est ac permagni momenti, quia summa utilitatum caussaque tota in ipsa consistit, Ecclesia quidem una potest maxime. Quibus enim instrumentis ad permovendos animos utitur, ea sibi hanc ipsam ob causam tradita a Iesu Christo sunt, virtutemque habent divinitus insitam. Istiusmodi instrumenta sola sunt, quae cordis attingere penetrales sinus apte queant, hominemque adducere ut obedientem se praebeat officio motus animi appetentis regat, Deum et proximos caritate diligat singulari ac summa, omniaque animose perrumpat, quae virtutis impediunt cursum. Satis est in hoc genere exempla veterum paulisper cogitatione repetere. Res et facta commemoramus, quae dubitationem nullam habent: scilicet civilem hominum communitatem funditus esse institutis christianis renovatam: huiusce virtute renovationis ad meliora promotum genus humanum, immo revocatum ab interitu ad vitam, auctumque perfectione tanta, ut nec extiterit ulla antea, nec sit in omnes consequentes aetates futura maior. Denique Iesum Christum horum esse beneficiorum principium eundem et finem: ut ab eo profecta, sic ad eum omnia referenda. Nimirum accepta Evangelii luce, cum incarnationis Verbi hominumque redemptionis grande mysterium orbis terrarum didicisset, vita Iesu Christi Dei et hominis pervasit civitates, eiusque fide et praeceptis et legibus totas imbuat. Quare si societati generis humani medendum est, revocatio vitae institutorumque christianorum sola medebitur. De societatibus enim dilabentibus illud rectissime praecipitur, revocari ad origines suas, cum restitui volunt, oportere. Haec enim omnium consociationum perfectio est, de eo laborare idque assequi, cuius gratia institutae sunt: ita ut motus actusque sociales eadem causa pariat, quae peperit societatem. Quamobrem declinare ab instituto, corruptio est: ad institutum redire, sanatio. Verissimeque id quemadmodum de toto reipublicae corpore, eodem modo de illo ordine civium dicimus, qui vitam sustentant opere, quae est longe maxima multitudo.

Nec tamen putandum, in colendis animis totas esse Ecclesiae curas ita defixas, ut ea negligat quae ad vitam pertinent mortalem ac terrenam. De proletariis nominatim vult et contendit ut emergant e miserrimo statu fortunamque meliorem adipiscantur.

Atque in id confert hoc ipso operam non mediocrem, quod vocat et instituit homines ad virtutem. Mores enim christiani, ubi servantur integri, partem aliquam prosperitatis sua sponte pariunt rebus externis, quia conciliant principium ac fontem omnium bonorum Deum: coercent geminas vitae pestes, quae nimium saepe hominem efficiunt in ipsa opum abundantia miserum, rerum appetentiam nimiam et voluptatum sitim:¹ contenti denique cultu victuque frugi, vectigal parsimonia supplent, procul a vitiis, quae non modo exiguas pecunias, sed maximas etiam copias exhauriunt, et lauta patrimonia dissipant. Sed praeterea, ut bene habeant proletarii, recta providet, instituendis foven-disque rebus, quas ad sublevandam eorum inopiam intelligat conducibiles. Quin in hoc etiam genere beneficiorum ita semper excelluit, ut ab ipsis inimicis praedicatione efferatur. Ea vis erat apud vetustissimos christianos caritatis mutuae, ut persaepe sua se reprivarent, opitulandi caussa, divitiores: quamobrem *neque . . . quisquam egenus erat inter illos.*² Diaconis, in id nominatim ordine instituto, datum ab Apostolis negotium, ut quotidianae beneficentiae exercerent munia: ac Paulus Apostolus, etsi sollicitudine districtus omnium Ecclesiarum, nihilominus dare se in laboriosa itinera non dubitavit, quo ad tenuiores christianos stipem praesens afferret. Cuius generis pecunias, a christianis in unoquoque conventu ultro collatas, *deposita pietatis* nuncupat Tertullianus, quod scilicet insumerentur *egenis alendis humanisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, inque domesticis senibus item naufragis.*³ Hinc sensim illud extitit patrimonium, quod religiosa cura tamquam rem familiarem indigentium Ecclesia custodivit. Immo vero subsidia miserae plebi, remissa rogandi verecundia, comparavit. Nam et locupletium et indigentium communis parens, excitata ubique ad excellentem magnitudinem caritate, collegia condidit sodalium religiosorum, aliaque utiliter permulta instituit, quibus opem ferentibus, genus miseriarum prope nullum esset, quod eodem modo fecere olim ethnici, ad arguendam transgrediuntur Ecclesiam huius etiam tam egregiae caritatis: cuius in locum subrogare visum est constitutam legibus publicis beneficentiam. Sed quae christianam caritatem suppleant, totam se ad alienas porrigentem utilitates, artes humanae

¹ *Radix omnium malorum est cupiditas.* 1 Tim. vi. 10.

² Act. iv. 34.

³ Apol. ii. 39.

nullae reperientur. Ecclesiae solius est illa virtus, quia nisi a sacratissimo Iesu Christi corde ducitur, nulla est uspiam: vagatur autem a Christo longius, quicumque ab Ecclesia discesserit.

At vero non potest esse dubium quin, ad id quod est propositum, ea quoque, quae in hominum potestate sunt, adjumenta requirantur. Omnino omnes, ad quos caussa pertinet, eodem intendant idemque laborent pro rata parte necesse est. Quod habet quamdam cum moderatrice mundi providentia similitudinem: fere enim videmus rerum exitus a quibus caussis pendent, ex earum omnium conspiratione procedere.

Jamvero quota pars remedii a republica expectanda sit, praestat exquirere. Rempubicam hoc loco intelligimus non quali populus utitur unus vel alter, sed qualem et vult recta ratio naturae congruens, et probant divinae documenta sapientiae, quae Nos ipsi nominatim in litteris Encyclicis de civitatum constitutione christiana explicavimus. Itaque per quos civitas regitur, primum conferre operam generatim atque universe debent tota ratione legum atque institutorum, scilicet efficiendo ut ex ipsa conformatione atque administratione reipublicae ultro prosperitas tam communitatis quam privatorum efflorescat. Id est enim civilis prudentiae munis propriumque eorum qui praesunt, officium. Nunc vero illa maxime efficiunt prosperas civitates, morum probitas, recte atque ordine constitutae familiae, custodia religionis ac justitiae, onerum publicorum cum moderata irrogatio, tum aequae partitio, incrementa artium et mercaturae, florens agrorum cultura, et si qua sunt alia generis ejusdem, quae quo majore studio provehuntur, eo melius sunt victuri cives et beatius. Harum igitur virtute rerum in potestate rectorum civitatis est ut ceteris prodesse ordinibus, sic et proletariorum conditionem juvare plurimum: idque jure suo optimo, neque ulla cum importunitatis suspicione: debet enim respublica ex lege muneris sui in commune consulere. Quo autem commodorum copia provenerit ex hac generali providentia maior, eo minus oportebit, alias ad opificum salutem expiriri vias.

Sed illud praeterea considerandum, quod rem altius attingit, unam civitatis esse rationem, communem summorum atque infimorum. Sunt nimirum proletarii pari jure cum locupletibus natura cives, hoc est partes verae vitamque viventes, unde constat, interjectis familiis, corpus reipublicae: ut ne illud adjungatur, in omni urbe eos esse numero longe maximo. Cum igitur illud sit perabsurdum, parti civium consulere, partem negligere, conse-

quitur, in salute commodisque ordinis proletariorum tuendis curas debitas collocari publice oportere: ni fiat, violatum iri iustitiam, suum cuique tribuere praecipientem. Qua de re sapienter S. Thomas: *sicut pars et totum quodammodo sunt idem, ita id, quod est totius, quodammodo est partis*.¹ Proinde in officiis non paucis neque levibus populo bene consulentium principum, illud in primis eminet, ut unumquemque civium ordinem aequabiliter tueantar, ea nimirum quae *distributiva* appellatur, iustitia inviolate servanda.

Quamvis autem cives universos, nemine excepto, conferre aliquid in summam bonorum communium necesse sit, quorum aliqua pars virilis sponte recidit in singulos, tamen idem et ex aequo conferre nequaquam possunt. Qualescumque sint in imperii generibus vicissitudines, perpetua futura sunt ea in civium statu discrimina, sine quibus nec esse, nec cogitari societas ulla posset. Omnino necesse est quosdam reperiri, qui e reipublicae dedant, qui leges condant, qui jus dicant, denique quorum consilio atque, auctoritate negotia urbana, res bellicae administrentur. Quorum virorum priores esse partes, eosque habendos in omni populo primarios, nemo non videt, propterea quod communi bono dant operam proxime atque excellenti ratione. Contra vero qui in arte aliqua exercentur, non ea, qua illi, ratione nec iisdem muneribus prosunt civitati: sed tamen plurimum et ipsi, quamquam minus directe, utilitati publicae inserviunt. Sane sociale bonum cum debeat esse ejusmodi, ut homines ejus fiant adeptione meliores, est profecto in virtute praecipue collocandum. Nihilominus ad bene constitutam civitatem suppeditatio quoque pertinet bonorum corporis atque externorum, *quorum usus est necessarius ad actum virtutis*.² Iamvero his pariendis bonis est proletariorum maxime efficax ac necessarius labor, sive in agris artem atque manum, sive in officinis exerceant. Immo eorum in hoc genere vis est atque efficientia tanta, ut illud verissimum sit, non aliunde quam ex opificum labore gigni divitias civitatum. Jubet igitur aequitas curam de proletario publice geri, ut ex eo, quod in communem effert utilitatem, percipiat ipse aliquid, ut tectus, ut vestitus, ut salvus vitam tolerare minus aegre possit. Unde consequitur, favendum rebus omnibus esse quae conditioni opificum quoquo modo videantur profuturae. Quae cura tantum abest ut noceat cuiquam,

¹ II-II. Quaest. lxi. a. 1. ad. 2.

² S. Thom. De Reg. Princip. i. c. xv.

ut potius profutura sit universis, quia non esse omnibus modis eos miseros, a quibus tam necessaria bona proficiscuntur; prorsus interest reipublicae.

Non civem, ut diximus, non familiam absorberi a republica rectum est: suam utrique facultatem agendi cum libertate permittere aequum est, quantum incolumni bono communi et sine cujusquam injuria potest. Nihilominus eis, qui imperant, videndum ut communitatem ejusque partes tueantur. Communitatem quidem, quippe quam summae potestati conservandam natura commisit usque eo, ut publicae custodia salutis non modo suprema lex, sed tota caussa sit ratioque principatus: partes vero, quia procurationem, reipublicae non ad utilitatem eorum, quibus commissa est, sed ad eorum, qui commissi sunt, natura pertinere, philosophia pariter et fides christiana consentiunt. Cumque imperandi facultas proficiscatur a Deo, ejusque sit communicatio quaedam summi principatus, gerenda ad exemplar est potestatis divinae, non minus rebus singulis quam universis cura paterna consulentis. Si quid igitur detrimenti allatum sit aut impendeat rebus communibus, aut singulorum ordinum rationibus, quod sanari aut prohiberi alia ratione non possit, obviam iri auctoritate publica necesse est. Atqui interest salutis tum publicae, tum privatae pacatas esse res et compositas: item dirigi ad Dei iussa naturaeque principia omnem convictus domestici disciplinam: observari et coli religionem: florere privatim ac publice mores integros: sanctam retineri justitiam, nec alteros ab alteris impune violari: validos adolescere cives, iuvandae tutandaeque, si res postulet, civitati idoneos. Quamobrem si quando fiat, ut quippiam barbarum impendeat ob secessionem opificum, aut intermissas ex composito operas: ut naturalia familiae nexa apud proletarios relaxentur: ut religio in opificibus violetur non satis impertiendo commodi ad officia pietatis: si periculum in officinis integritati morum ingruat a sexu promiscuo, aliisve perniciosis invitamentis peccandi: aut opificum ordinem herilis ordo iniquis premat oneribus, vel alienis a persona ac dignitate humana conditionibus affligat: si valetudini noceatur opere immodico, nec ad sexum aetatemve accommodato, his in caussis plane adhibenda, certos intra fines, vis et auctoritas legum. Quos fines eadem, quae legum poscit opem, caussa determinat: videlicet non plura suscipienda legibus, nec ultra progrediendum, quam incommodorum, sanatio, vel periculi depulsio requirat.

Jura quidem, in quocumque sint, sancte servanda sunt:

atque ut suum singuli teneant, debet potestas publica providere, propulsandis atque ulciscendis iniuriis. Nisi quod in ipsis protegendis privatorum iuribus, praecipue est infimorum atque inopum habenda ratio. Siquidem natio divitum, suis septa praesidiis, minus eget tutela publica: miserum vulgus, nullis opibus suis tutum, in patrocínio reipublicae maxime nititur. Quocirca mercenarios, cum in multitudine egena numerentur debet cura providentiaque singulari complecti respublica.

Sed quaedam maioris momenti praestat nominatim perstringere. Caput autem est, imperio ac munimento legum tutari privatas possessiones oportere. Potissimumque, in tanto iam cupiditatum ardore, continenda in officio plebs: nam si ad meliora contendere concessum est non repugnante iustitia, at alteri, quod suum est, detrahare, ac per speciem absurdae cuiusdam aequabilitatis in fortunas alienas involare, iustitia vetat, nec ipsa communis utilitatis ratio sinit. Utique pars opificum longe maxima res meliores honesto labore comparare sine cuiusquam iniuria malunt: verumtamen non pauci numerantur pravis imbuti opinionibus rerumque novarum cupidi, qui id agunt omni ratione ut turbas moveant, ac ceteros ad vim impellant. Intersit igitur reipublicae auctoritas, iniectoque concitatoribus freno, ab opificum moribus corruptrices artes, a legitimis dominis periculum rapinarum coerceat.

Longinquior vel operosior labos, atque opinatio curtae mercedis caussam non raro dant artificibus quamobrem opere se solvant ex composito, otioque dedant voluntario. Cui quidem incommodo usitato et gravi medendum publice, quia genus istud cessationis non heros damtaxat, atque opifices ipsos afficit damno, sed mercaturis obest reique publicae utilitatibus: cumque haud procul esse a vi turbisque soleat, saepenumero tranquillitatem publicam in discrimen adducit. Qua in re illud magis efficax ac salubre, antevertere auctoritate legum, malumque ne crumpere possit prohibere, amotis mature caussis, unde dominorum atque operariorum conflictus videatur extituri.

Similique modo plura sunt in opifice, praesidio munienda reipublicae: ac primum animi bono. Siquidem vita mortalis quantumvis bona et optabilis, non ipsa tamen illud est ultimum, ad quod nati sumus: sed via tantummodo atque instrumentum ad animi vitam perspicientia veri et amore boni complendam. Animus est, qui expressam gerit imaginem similitudinemque divinam, et in quo principatus ille residet, per quem dominari

iussus est homo in inferiores naturas, atque efficere utilitati suae terras omnes et maria parentia. *Replete terram et subiicite eam : et dominamini piscibus maris et volatilibus coeli et universis animantibus quae moventur super terram.* Sunt omnes homines hac in re pares, nec quippiam est quod inter divites atque inopes, inter dominos et famulos, inter principes privatosque differat : *nam idem dominus omnium.*¹ Nemini licet hominus dignitatem, de qua Deus ipse disponit *cum magna reverentia*, impune violare, neque ad eam perfectionem impedire cursum, quae sit vitae in caelis sempiternae consentanea. Quin etiam in hoc genere tractari se non convenienter naturae suae, animique servitutem servire velle, ne sua quidem sponte homo potest : neque enim de iuribus agitur, de quibus sit integrum homini, verum de officiis adversus Deum, quae necesse est sancte servari.

Hinc consequitur requies operum et laborem per festos dies necessaria. Id tamen nemo intelligat de maiore quadam inertis otii usura, multoque minus de cessatione, qualem multi expetunt, faultrice vitiorum et ad effusiones pecuniarum adiutrice, sed omnino de requiete operum per religionem consecrata. Conjuncta cum religione quies sevocat hominem a laboribus negotiisque vitae quotidianae ut ad cogitanda revocet bona caelestia,tribuendumque cultum numini aeterno iustum ac debitum. Haec maxime natura atque haec caussa quietis est in dies festos capiendae : quod Deus et in Testamento veteri praecipua lege sanxit : *Memento ut diem sabbati sanctifices ;*² et facto ipse suo docuit, arcana requiete, statim posteaquam fabricatos hominem erat, sumpta : *Requievit die septimo ab universo opere quod patrarat.*⁴

Quod ad tutelam bonorum corporis et externorum, primum omnium eripere miseros opifices e saevitia oportet hominum cupidorum, personis pro rebus ad quaestum intemperanter abutentium. Scilicet tantum exigi operis, ut hebescat animus labore nimio, unaque corpus defatigationi succumbat, non iustitia, non humanitas patitur. In homine, sicut omnis natura sua, ita et vis efficiens certis est circumscripta finibus, extra quos egredi non potest. Acuitur illa quidem exercitatione atque usu, sed hac tamen lege ut agere intermittat identidem et acquiescat. De quotidiano igitur opere videndum ne in plures extrahatur horas, quam vires sinant. Intervalla vero quiescendi quanta esse oportet.

¹ Gen. i. 28.² Rom. x. 12.³ Exod. xx. 8.⁴ Gen. ii. 2.

teat, ex vario genere operis, ex adjunctis temporum et locorum, ex ipsa opificum valetudine iudicandum. Quorum est opus lapidem e terra excindere, aut ferrum, aes, aliaque id genus effodere penitus abdita, eorum labor, quia multo maior est idemque valetudini gravis, cum brevitate temporis est compensandus. Anni quoque dispicienda tempora : quia non raro idem operae genus alio tempore facile est ad tolerandum, alio aut tolerari nulla ratione potest, aut sine summa difficultate non potest.

Denique quod facere enitique vir adulta aetate beneque validus potest, id a femina puerove non est aequum postulare. Immo de pueris valde cavendum, ne prius officina capiat, quam corpus, ingenium, animum satis firmaverit aetas. Erumpentes enim in pueritia vires, velut herbescentem viriditatem, agitatio praecox elidit ; qua ex re omnis est institutio puerilis interitura. Sic certa quaedam artificia minus apte conveniunt in feminas ad opera domestica natas : quae quidem opera et tuentur, magnopere in muliebri genere decus, et liberorum institutioni prosperitatieque familiae natura respondent. Universe autem statuatur, tantum esse opificibus tribuendum otii, quantum cum viribus compensetur labore consumptis ; quia detritas usu vires debet cessatio restituere. In omni obligatione, qua dominis atque artificibus invicem contrahatur, haec semper aut adscripta aut tacita conditio inest, utrique generi quiescendi ut cautum sit : neque enim honestum esset convenire secus, quia nec postulare cuiquam fas est, nec spondere neglectum officiorum, quae vel Deo vel sibimetipsi hominem obstringunt.

(To be continued.)

Notices of Books.

LIFE OF BLESSED JOHN FISHER, BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, CARDINAL OF THE HOLY ROMAN CHURCH, MARTYR UNDER HENRY VIII. By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R. London: Burns & Oates.

LIFE AND WRITINGS OF SIR THOMAS MORE, LORD CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND, AND MARTYR UNDER HENRY VIII. By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R. London: Burns & Oates.

FATHER BRIDGETT has rendered incomparable service to the Catholic Church in England by the publication of these two beautiful biographies. The respectable Protestants of our time who have set their consciences to rest with the comfortable theory that whoever was responsible for the establishment of Protestantism in the past, there they find it to-day, and there it must remain, and that they can serve God in it as faithfully as elsewhere, must receive a rude awakening should these two comely volumes fall into their hands.

The author of the *Lives* of these two great saints does not enter professionally into the general history of the times with which he deals. His works are essentially biographies. They keep to the subject all through, without digressions or dissertations upon habits, customs, and characters that are not immediately concerned. And yet when one has got through these two volumes he has acquired a deeper insight into the doings of that ill-fated time than can be obtained from most histories. And Father Bridgett is always a safe guide. He sifts documents, opinions, and judgments with the skill of a practised critic. He always gives solid proofs when there is a point of controversy, and uses the advantages of his position with splendid force and effect. But a more lasting gain than any which accrues of a literary or historic kind is the deep mark, the profound and enduring impression on the soul which anyone must experience who reads these volumes. They present to us the acts and achievements of two of the noblest characters that ever adorned the annals of Church or State. We should like to quote many extracts from these two volumes. Unfortunately, space will not allow us to indulge our desire. All the more heartily, therefore, do we com-

mend the works themselves. They will not only repay perusal from a literary and historical point of view, but they will win the admiration and love of every reader for the two brave men who stood firm to the last in Catholic loyalty and faith, and whose pure and noble lives shine resplendent in the midst of so much corruption and treachery.

J. F. H.

THE VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE WORLDS. By Rev. J. W. Vahey Ridgeway, Wisconsin. Milwaukee: Hoffman Brothers.

THIS work embraces a vast variety of subjects. It deals with the infinitely great and the infinitely little. In about two hundred and seventy pages it undertakes to discuss and to solve some of the weightiest problems that ever presented themselves to the human mind. Atheists, Pantheists, Agnostics, Positivists, Free-thinkers, Evolutionists, Socialists, Communists, are all passed in review; and then we have the origin of the civil power and the divine right of kings; we have capital and labour; monopolies and trusts; the solar system; gravitation; the stars and the asteroids; comets and their chemistry; angels and saints; purgatory, hell, and heaven; God and Christianity—everything, in fact, that is comprised under the range of visible and invisible. The work is, indeed, a “summa” of human knowledge on a small scale, and malicious persons might be tempted to suspect that it is also a “summa” of the author’s on a large one. However, the people on the spot are, doubtless, the best judges of the requirements of their country, and we can well understand that such a work as this may be of service in America. It labours under the defect which is common to most works of the kind—that errors and objections are clearly and forcibly put, whilst the answers are often involved and not quite so intelligible. It is written in an excellent spirit, and, as the author says in the preface, should the Church pronounce against any of its opinions, he “will consider the same as erroneous.”

J. F. H.

VALENTINE RIAnt. A Review of “Notes and Recollections from 1860-1879.” By W. J. Anherst, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society.

THIS handsome little work of 114 pages has been written for the express purpose of calling attention to the life of Valentine Riant,

contained in a work entitled *Notes and Recollections from 1860-1879*, translated from the French by Lady Herbert. Copies of Lady Herbert's translation may be obtained at the Convent of Marie Réparatrice, Horley House, Marylebone Road, London.

The memoir has been compiled in order to give to the reading public a perfect example of Christian chivalry in the nineteenth century, whose words and works may be studied and imitated by the youth of the Christian world. The rev. reviewer, while referring us to Lady Herbert's translation for fuller and more ample details concerning the too short life of Mdlle. Riant, manages to communicate just so much information as makes us desirous of obtaining more. Reading the lives of those who have been remarkable in any age as faithful followers of Christ, is, no doubt, most edifying and instructive; but we agree with the reviewer, that there is another heroism besides that which is displayed by the martyr at the stake or on the scaffold, and this heroism consists in utter and absolute devotion of one's whole life to God's service, whether in religion or in the world. Such a heroine was Mdlle. Riant, and the story of her short life and of her many virtues cannot fail to exercise the most salutary influence on the minds and hearts of her contemporaries.

SPECIAL DEVOTION TO THE HOLY GHOST. Vol. I. By the Very Rev. Dr. Otto Zardetti. V.G. Milwaukee: Hoffmann Brothers.

THIS beautifully-bound volume has been called forth by the solemn and authoritative words of the American bishops at the last Plenary Council of Baltimore, and aims specially at providing the colleges and schools of America with a manual which will assist in explaining, cultivating, and popularizing the devotion to the Holy Ghost. The appearance of this work is most opportune, for what appear to be the great evils of the present time—religious indifference and reviving naturalism—can be best neutralized by the consciousness of the presence and in-dwelling in us and in the Church of God's Holy Ghost; while, at the same time, it can scarcely be denied that this eminently practical and Christian devotion is hardly known, or rarely practised, among the faithful. The treatises of Cardinal Manning, who may be called the apostle of this devotion, are beyond the reach of many, and until now no effort has been made to meet the demand for a manual of this devotion, which should be at once comprehensive, practical, and

devotional. There is every reason to believe that this volume, the first of a promised series by the same author, will meet the wants and requirements of intelligent worshippers of the Holy Spirit. The nature of this devotion, its peculiar fitness for the time in which we live, and the formal observances requisite for its congregational practice are set forth with directness and lucidity. The author enlarges on the many offices which are ascribed by the Church to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, and concludes this volume with an appropriate collection of prayers and hymns calculated to inspire and strengthen devotion to the Sanctifier.

THE POET'S PURGATORY, AND OTHER POEMS. By H. D. Ryder, of the Oratory. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1890.

POEMS OF THE PAST. By *Moi-Même*. Same Publishers, 1890.

POEMS AND BALLADS OF YOUNG IRELAND. Same Publishers.

IN *The Poet's Purgatory* the poem from which Father Ryder's collection takes its name, the

"Votaries of nature who had found their joy
In echoing the praise of field and flood,
Winning a rapture from each floweret coy
On river bank or in the fragrant wood
From all but Him who made the source of all their good,"

are represented by the author in the life that follows the present, as

"A pallid band of ghosts. . . .
On every face the dreadful stamp of pain
From ceaseless searching after banished rest."

Such a fate for such a cause shall certainly never overtake either the author of the *Poet's Purgatory*, or *Moi-Même*. For, though each muse exults in the poetry of Nature, and knows "to win a rapture from each floweret coy," yet neither has forgotten "Him who made the source of all their good." Through both collections breathe a deep religious feeling, which surely for the Christian reader must lend an additional charm to even the most sublime creation of the poet's fancy. This is particularly true of *Poems of the Past*, of which there is a large and varied collection. Here are a few extracts, taken at random, which give a fair idea of the style and the

spirit of this collection. From "My Madonna" we take the following:—

"Beautiful face! as I gaze on thee now,
With the rich glow of sunset retouching thy brow,
And thy mild eyes so tenderly resting on me,
'My Mother' I lovingly utter to thee.

Beautiful face! how content shall I be
If death find my dying glance resting on thee,
As the deep golden hues of the sunset decay
And my fast-waning spirit is ebbing away."

This is from "My Crucifix":—

"When life seems rough and thorny and no sunbeam gilds the way,
It sheds upon its rugged track a cheering, bright'ning ray;
It knows my heart's best secrets, my every wish and sigh;
I whisper to it all my cares and griefs when none are nigh.

Oh when I press it to my lips, and on its Image gaze,
And see the proof of tenderness each loving wound displays,
Stilled is my restless heart, e'en when most tempted to rebel.
Sweet lessons of my Crucifix! oh, may I learn thee well!"

Who *Moi-Même* is we are not told. That she is a lady any dozen lines in this collection of her poems proves conclusively; not because the poems betray the want of strength generally associated with the female character, but because they reveal the devotion, the self-denial, and, above all, the tenderness and sweetness which find a suitable home only in the heart of a Christian lady. That her heart beats under the humble habit of a *Religieuse*, the intense but at the same time trained and solid piety pervading every line of her poems clearly shows; while her touching centenary tribute to Nano Nagle leaves no room for doubt as to the particular Sisterhood to which she belongs. We sincerely wish her *Poems of the Past* a wide circulation. Were we in a position to do so we would bestow a copy on every boy and girl in Ireland, with full confidence that the intelligent perusal of its contents would tend powerfully to elevate and strengthen their character, while communicating to their still impressionable hearts some sparks of the divine fire which animates the breast of the humble *Moi-Même*.

The *Poems and Ballads* are not of the Young Ireland of '48, but of that of '88. Two of the contributors, Ellen O'Leary and Rose Kavanagh, have, since the publication of this booklet, resigned their places in the earthly choir to join the celestial. Among the others are Katharine Tynan, T. W. Rolleston, John Todhunter, and W. B. Yeats.

D. O'L.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

AUGUST, 1891.

ST. AIDAN, OR MAIDOC, BISHOP OF FERNS.¹

THE sixth and seventh centuries were glorious ones in the annals of the Irish Church. A hundred years after the blessed Patrick had landed on the soil of Erin, the faith had spread throughout the length and breadth of the land. The warlike spirit of the ancient clans—still hot and unsubdued—was gradually being curbed under the gentle yoke of the Gospel, and it was no uncommon thing for the prince or the monarch to exchange the court for the cloister, the royal robe for the mean habit of the monk. The wild islands off the western coast, the peaceful valleys, the lovely lake sides of the north and south became centres of monastic life, and of those famous cloister schools in which the lamp of learning burnt brightly in days of war and strife, and the song of praise ascended day and night before the throne of God. In the sixth century St. Finnian founded the monastery of Innisfallen, on an island in the lower Lake of Killarney—a lovely spot, rendered still more heavenly by the saintly lives of the monks. The Shannon banks were sanctified by the famous abbey and school of Clon-mac-nois, established by St.

¹ The Irish expressed devotion to a saint by using the diminutive of his name, or prefixing the pronoun *mo*, *my*. *Aedh* was the bishop's name; the Latin form was *Aedanus*; the Irish diminutive *Aedh-og*; with the prefix *mo*, *Mo-aedh-og*, or *Moedhog*, or *Mogue*. The saint's name is now written *Maidoc*, or *Aidan*. *Todd's Life of St. Patrick*, page 115, note.

Kiernan in the year 548; and in the following year St. Kevin selected as the site for what was to prove the great university of Glendalough, the weird and romantic spot now known as the Seven Churches. Lismore, too, and the Blackwater were enriched with their famous cloister school at the end of the sixth century, through the labours of St. Faidhe Fland. But enough. To name all the abodes of piety and learning that adorned Erin in those days were an endless task. Ireland was covered with monasteries; and so great was the reputation of her schools, that men flocked thither from all parts of Europe to imbibe the true principles of religion and learning. Nor was this all. From the cloisters of Ireland went forth valiant missionaries into foreign lands to carry the light of the Gospel to foreign shores. St. Columba founded the famous monastery of Iona, from which his disciples went forth to convert the Scots, and to share in the evangelization of England. St. Columbanus preached in Gaul and Germany; he established in the Vosges the great monastery of Luxeuil and the abbey of Bobbio, near Milan; whilst to the zeal and activity of St. Gall we owe the celebrated abbey of that name, situated on the Lake of Constance. In a word, in those days Irish missionaries were to be found everywhere in the front ranks of the army of the Church, extending her empire and strengthening it by the establishment of schools of learning and discipline.

The life of St. Maidoc belongs partly to the sixth and partly to the seventh century. He was born of royal blood, for his father, Setna, prince of Breffny,¹ of the Hy-Briun sept, was descended from a former king of Ireland, and his mother, Ethne, was of the house of Amalgaid, who was king of Connaught when St. Patrick landed in Ireland.² Setna and his wife Ethne were a holy and God-fearing couple, who dwelt in a place called Inisbreagmuig, in the present county of Cavan. Though married many years, they had not been blessed with children; and they prayed to God, and gave large alms, with the hope that they might not be left without an

¹ Equivalent to the counties of Cavan and Leitrim. Ware, *History of Ireland*, vol. i., page 46.

² *Four Masters*, 449, note g.

heir. More than that, they got the monks of the monastery of Drumlane¹ to offer up prayers to God for them with the same intention. Their faith was not left unrewarded. It is related that some little time before the birth of our saint a bright star was seen descending from heaven upon his mother Ethne, an earnest of the future brilliancy of his life and example. Maidoc was born in the island of Inisbreagmuig, probably about the year 540.²

The ancient sons of Erin loved the river banks and the secluded islands in the lakes, and so we find the ancestral home of the Hy-Briuns of Breffny on an island in the county Cavan. Here the young Maidoc spent his childhood and the early days of his boyhood. To his pious parents he was a subject of tender solicitude. No doubt they regarded him as

¹ In county Cavan, near Belturbet.

² The date of St. Maidoc's birth is not without difficulty. Lanigan (*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii., page 333, and note 125) places it in 560 or thereabouts. Harris and Ussher incline to an earlier date. In the Bollandists, under date of January 31st, the following extract from the notes of Serrarius, for September 7th, is given:—"Item hac die S. Modoci Episcopi in Scotia, qui vixit circa annum 534." It seems necessary to place the date of our saint somewhere about the year 540, from the facts recorded in the sixth chapter of his life. Here it is stated that he and St. Laisrean were companions (*socii*), and at the time in question decided to part company. From the context this appears to have been before St. Laisrean founded his monastery at Devenish, which he did about the year 560. Indeed, his death is put down in the *Four Masters* as having occurred in 563. Certainly it was not later than 570. It is clear, therefore, that the parting of the two friends cannot have been long after the year 560, and hence 560 was not the year of our saint's birth. On the other hand, a difficulty arises from the event recorded in the second chapter—that Maidoc, whilst yet a little boy (*parvulus*), was a hostage in the hands of Ainmire, king of Ireland (*rex Temoriæ*), who reigned from 564 to 566 (*Four Masters*). From this it seems to follow that Maidoc was not born long before 560. But then, we may ask, was Ainmire really king of Ireland when Maidoc was a hostage in his hands? We might suggest:—(1) That the writer of St. Maidoc's life, writing after Ainmire had been king of Ireland, might have referred to him as *rex Temoriæ*, though at the time of the incident recorded he had not yet attained to that dignity. (2) In one manuscript copy of the life of St. Maidoc (cf. *Lives of Cambro-British Saints*, page 283), Ainmire in this context is called only *rex Magnus*. (3) Before Ainmire becomes king of Ireland he is referred to in the *Four Masters* at the year 557 as king, and as being one of many chieftains that exact hostages from a conquered foe. (4) Neighbouring septs were continually at war with one another, and there is nothing unlikely in the fact that the prince of the Hy-Nials should have exacted hostages from the princes of Breffny, without the intervention of the king of Ireland.

a special trust from God, the fruit of much prayer and almsgiving, and so they carefully watched over him from his infancy, and taught him to walk in the way of holiness and virtue. Nor was the child slow to respond to the instructions he received. The grace of God was manifest in him from the first. He kept his soul unspotted from the defilements of sin, and, even at this early age, God manifested His special love for the child by according to him the gift of miracles.¹

The territory of the Hy-Nials lay at no great distance from that of the Hy-Briiuns. Now, in those days wars were of very frequent occurrence, not only between the supreme king and his foreign foes, but between province and province, between sept and sept.² One of these numerous struggles took place between the princes of Breffny and the Hy-Nial sept whilst Ainmire was king of the Hy-Nials, and it ended in Ainmire demanding hostages from the family of the Hy-Briiuns. The sons of the noblest in the land had to be delivered over to the conqueror,³ and amongst the number was Maidoc, still a little boy. When the youths were ushered into the presence of the king, he was at once struck with the appearance of the youthful Maidoc. A heavenly beauty and the grace of God shone in the boy's face, and, unsolicited, the king offered to receive him into his court, or, if he preferred it, to send him back to his home. The boy, however, with a courage beyond his years, declined any special favour for himself, and begged the king to extend his favour to all his fellow-prisoners. His unselfishness did not go unrewarded. The noble bearing, and perhaps also the reputation for holiness which the saint had gained even at that early age, moved the generosity of Ainmire. He dismissed all the boys, without ransom, to their homes, requesting only a remembrance in the prayers of the youthful Maidoc.

The days of our saint's childhood and boyhood quickly passed away. He grew daily in virtue and in the esteem of

¹ *Life*, chapter iii.

² Cf. Moore's *Ireland*, vol. i., page 170.

³ In the *Life* of St. Aidus (*Camb.-Brit. Saints*) the number is put at fifty-three boys.

his neighbours, passing his time in tending the flocks, in simple pastimes and in prayer to God. The great promise he gave of a brilliant future did not escape the watchful eye of his parents. They determined that he should have the advantage of a good education; and accordingly it was decided that he should be entrusted to the care of some holy men to be instructed in the knowledge proper to his station.

Ten or fifteen years previous to the birth of St. Maidoc, the great monastic school of Clonard¹ had been founded by St. Finnian.² Baptized and instructed by one of the immediate disciples of St. Patrick, St. Finnian studied both in Ireland and in Britain, and was intimate with St. David, St. Gildas and St. Cadoc. After having founded many establishments in Ireland, about the year 530 he erected in a desert place the monastery of Clonard, and he was soon (so great was the reputation of his learning and of his school) surrounded by disciples and scholars to the number of three thousand, including some of the greatest of the Irish saints, as Columba, Kieran, and Brendan. To this abode of learning and sanctity the young Maidoc was sent by his parents.³ Perhaps when our young saint first went there, Clonard was still presided over by its venerable founder, who in all probability did not die till the year 552. If not, St. Senachus, one of the greatest of his disciples, was bishop and abbot of Clonard. No doubt, too, the presence of St. Laisrean at the new school of St. Finnian was an additional inducement for the pious Setna to send his son there; for Laisrean, too, was a native of Breffny, and would be

¹ In the county Meath.

² Cf. Lanigan, vol. i., page 464, &c.

³ There is no direct evidence that St. Maidoc was at the school of Clonard, but indirectly it seems to be a necessary consequence of what is related in the life of our saint (chap. vi). Here it is stated that St. Laisrean and St. Maidoc were companions, evidently meaning that they had long lived together, and were then going to part company. This event we have already shown took place about the year 560, and very shortly after St. Laisrean left Clonard (Lanigan, vol. ii., page 218). Moreover, at that date Maidoc can only have just left school. Where, then, can the two saints have become intimate, if not at Clonard? Moreover, that our saint was at Clonard is in itself a very likely thing, since it was one of the most noted schools of the day.

sure to take a kindly interest in his young kinsman Maidoc.

The life of our saint at Clonard was very unlike school life in these days.¹ It was a real preparation for a life of hardship and privation. Students were there assembled in great numbers from all parts, from every class of society. Prince and peasant were treated alike. No allowance was made for nobility of birth. Accustomed as he was to the attentions accorded to children of high rank, when he entered the school of Clonard, Maidoc had to join the rest in working for his maintenance and that of the establishment; and, no doubt, as was the case with the great St. Columba, he had much to endure on the score of his noble blood. But the great work of the day was the acquisition of knowledge. The Latin tongue had to be mastered, the ancient classics to be read; the science of theology, such as it existed in those days, had to be studied; above all, the Sacred Scriptures had to be pondered on and expounded. Nor were the art of versification and the rudiments of music neglected. Music was much cultivated and loved by the Irish of those days, and no school existed in which some knowledge of it was not imparted to the students.

Maidoc was a lover of nature, and in his leisure hours he used to wander forth into some retired spot, book in hand,² and there spend the time in reading and prayer. He was naturally gentle and loving in his disposition. Suffering of any kind, even in dumb animals, appealed to him. Thus it is recorded of him, how once, as he was reading in the woods near Clonard, a stag, wearied with the chase, came up to him, pursued by a pack of dogs and a troop of huntsmen. The helpless condition of the animal moved his commiseration, and he helped it to escape from its hungry pursuers.

How long Maidoc remained at Clonard we are unable to say. Assuredly, it is not unlikely that he left that abode of learning together with St. Laisrean somewhere about the

¹ Cf. *Christian Schools and Scholars*, vol. i., page 66.

² *Life*. chapter v.

year 560. At all events, about that time we find the two friends together, having apparently been comrades for many years. St. Laisrean was, we know, established as abbot in his new monastery of Devenish in the year 563; and it was shortly after leaving the school of Clonard that he entered on the labour of founding that abbey.¹ On the other hand, considering the age of St. Maidoc, it is unlikely that he left school long before the year 560. Laisrean was considerably older than his friend, and, no doubt, had devoted many years to lecturing and teaching at the school of Clonard. In that establishment a solid friendship grew up and matured between the two holy men, and now that they had left that abode of learning the question arose, whether they were to labour together in the service of God or not. On a certain day as they were praying together for light to settle that important question, God seems to have revealed to them His will in the matter in a very unmistakable way. They were to separate. Laisrean was to labour in the north, Maidoc in the south, but not yet for many years. The biographer² of our saint relates that as the two saints were praying together for light, two trees near them suddenly fell, one towards the north, and the other towards the south; that towards the north being near St. Laisrean, that towards the south near St. Maidoc. The holy men considered that they were to regard this remarkable occurrence as a manifestation to them of the will of God.

St. Laisrean lost no time in entering upon his work. Having obtained a grant of an island in Loch Erne, called Damh-inis, he there erected a monastery, which was famous for many years to come. But Maidoc was still young; and yet, young as he was, his reputation for sanctity had spread far and wide, and was attended by miracles. Shortly after St. Laisrean had settled in the Island of Damh-inis, his friend Maidoc was staying with him on a visit. It happened—so we read in the life of the saint—that one day three sons of a certain pious woman who dwelt near

¹ Lanigan, vol. ii., page 218.

² Probably a certain St. Evin.

the lake were drowned, and the disconsolate mother, coming to St. Laisrean, besought him to restore her children to her. He referred her to St. Maidoc, who, moved by the good woman's entreaties, prayed to God for her, and restored her sons to her, safe and sound. The result of all this was natural. Crowds of persons kept coming to our saint, requesting him to allow them to become his disciples, and to direct them in the spiritual life. This was very trying to his humility. He shrunk from the eminence to which he was rising. He felt that the time for his public work had not yet arrived; and at length, seeing that he had no chance of finding a place of seclusion in Ireland, he determined to leave his country and embrace the monastic life in another land.

In our own days a passage from Ireland to England is a very easy matter. It was not so in the sixth century. The sons of Erin in those days braved the dangers of the deep in fragile barks formed of ribs of osier covered with hides, called *currachs*.¹ It was in such a vessel that St. Cormac, as we read in St. Adamnan's life of St. Columba, sailed from Iona, to seek out some solitary island in the ocean, and was for fourteen days out of sight of land. But Maidoc's zeal in God's service overcame his dread of the perils of the deep. He had, however, a difficulty to overcome before he could set out upon his journey. Albus, Prince of the Hy-Briun sept, hearing of his intention of leaving the country, was unwilling to part with so great a treasure from his kingdom. He threw obstacles in the way of our saint's departure, and it was only by flying stealthily away, and crossing over into the province of Leinster, that Maidoc was able to carry his intention into execution. Travelling down to the south of Ireland, he set sail from some part of the coast of the county Wexford, and landed safely in Milford Haven.

In those days St. David was the great light of the Welsh Church. A disciple of St. Paulinus, he had spent many years in the Isle of Wight, and had returned thence into

¹ Ware, *History of Ireland*. Of the boats covered with hides in use among the early Irish. Vol. i., chap. xxiv., page 178.

Wales full of fervour and apostolic zeal. He founded abbeys in many parts of the country, and became the spiritual father of an innumerable family of monks whom he led to perfection by his doctrine and example. His great monastery was in the Vale of Ross, near Menevia. Situated on the most westerly promontory of Pembrokeshire, the monastery was built in a secluded spot, about half a mile from the sea, and surrounded on three sides by steep and rugged hills. To this school of monastic discipline many eminent servants of God came to be instructed by St. David in the science of the saints. It was to the monastery of Menevia and to St. David¹ that Maidoc was now journeying. When he arrived at the monastery gates, he did not find any gorgeous buildings like the Glastonbury, or Westminster, or Tewkesbury of the middle ages. At Menevia everything was of the most primitive simplicity. The monks lived in little separate cells or huts. The common refectory and the church were built of wattles and wood cemented with mud, and roofed with straw or sedge. The whole was probably enclosed within a rampart or mound, and presented the appearance of a poor village.

When our young saint presented himself at the monastery gates, after his tedious and dangerous journey, his reception was anything but encouraging. Indeed, were he not fortified by the grace of God, and a firm determination to persevere in the good work he had taken in hand, he would most certainly have returned again to Ireland. For the community did not easily admit recruits into their ranks.

“Whosoever desired to join himself to their holy society, was obliged to remain ten days at the door of the monastery, acknowledging himself a wretched sinner, and unworthy to be admitted among them : where he was severely tried by rude words and rough usage, which if he patiently endured all that time, he was then taken in by the senior religious, who had the care of

¹ Though Ussher, Harris, and Ware (bishops, Ferns) hold that St. David died in 544, it seems to us, with Lanigan (vol. i., 477), and others, that that date is out of the question, and that St. David lived till the end of the sixth century.

the gate, and was by him instructed, and exercised for a long time in painful labours and grievous mortifications; and so at length, was admitted to the fellowship of the rest of the brethren, leaving all his worldly substance behind him, of which the community would take no part."¹

Maidoc, was, however, prepared for all that. He passed successfully through his term of probation, and was admitted into the community. Nor was his life then an easy one. On the contrary, the severity of the rule was such as might reasonably have made the most fervent waver. "During their work the religious employed themselves in the contemplation of heavenly things. Having finished their work abroad in the fields (according to the time allotted to them), they returned to the monastery, and spent what time remained, till the evening, either in reading, or writing, or praying. In the evening they all went to the church, where they continued in prayer till the stars appeared, and then took their meal all altogether, eating sparingly, and not to satiety: their food was bread, with herbs or roots, seasoned with salt; their drink was a mixture of milk and water. After supper they remained about three hours employed in watching, prayer and adoration, and then went to rest. They rose again at cock-crowing, and continued at their prayers till day,"² Labour was enjoined on all; they were clothed in the skins of beasts; they never spoke, except when necessity required it. Such was the rule of life followed at Menevia. As for the young Maidoc, he entered upon the hard duties of the monastic life with fervour and zeal. He surpassed the brethren in humility and obedience, and because of his regularity in the observance of the rule he was especially loved by the holy abbot, St. David.

Our saint had other crosses to bear besides the mere hardships of the monastic rule. Even an Apostle fell away. Judas betrayed his Master. No wonder, then, if bad men are found from time to time within the walls of monasteries. Such a man was the bursar or *œconomus*, called in Irish the *Fertighis*,

¹ *Britannia Sancta*, part i., page 142. Cf. "Vita S. Davidis per Ricemarchum" (*Camb. Brit. Saints*, page 128).

² *Brit. Sancta*, part i., page 142; "Vita S. David," *ut supra*.

of St. David's monastery. The œconomus was an official of much importance. His duty was to look after the domestic affairs of the monastery, to see that it was supplied with necessaries, and to superintend the labour of the monks for the service of the community.¹ The œconomus at Menevia hated our saint without a cause, and took advantage of every opportunity to annoy him. One day, as Maidoc was reading in his cell, he came to him, and ordered him off in injurious language to help the brethren to fetch wood to the monastery; for it so happened that, unknown to our saint, the brethren had gone out into the woods in the morning for that purpose. Maidoc obeyed with alacrity, and in his hurry left his book lying outside on the ground. The œconomus now gave him two unbroken oxen to yoke under a waggon, without proper harness. But God was with the holy man. The oxen worked quietly, and he reached the place where the brethren were working without mishap.

The holy abbot David was not unaware of what had taken place. Now, in those days books were very much more valuable than they are now; so, as it had begun to rain heavily, he went out to pick up Maidoc's book, which lay upon the ground. He found it perfectly dry. Still, though the holy man fully recognised the miracle that had taken place, he determined not to lose the opportunity for administering a salutary reproof to his disciple, and accordingly hastened to where the brethren were labouring near the sea-side. Coming up to Maidoc, he asked him sternly why he had left his book exposed to the rain. The saint, seeing that the abbot was angry with him, prostrated himself at his feet without replying; and there upon the ground St. David left him, and returned to the monastery. Nor did Maidoc arise till one of the monks sent by St. David summoned him to him. Then, in presence of the whole community—for he knew where the blame lay—the holy bishop sharply rebuked the œconomus.

But Satan had entered into the heart of that unhappy man. He was consumed with envy, and determined at last

¹ Cf. Dr. Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 166-169.

to murder our saint. For this purpose he hired a certain wicked layman, and sent him with Maidoc to cut down firewood. As the two were so engaged, whilst our saint was bending down to move a log of wood, the wretched man raised his axe with the intention of bringing it down on Maidoc's head. He was, however, stricken before he had time to carry out his nefarious design, and both his arms were paralyzed. Terrified at the sudden judgment of God, he confessed the whole plot, and begged pardon from the man of God. Maidoc, rejoiced at the man's repentance rather than at his own escape, prayed to God for him, and he recovered the use of his arms. St. David, when he heard what had taken place, was proceeding to inflict chastisement on the wretched oconomus; but, at the request of Maidoc, he left him unpunished. And, indeed, God Himself punished the unhappy man, for he died miserably a short time afterwards.

Day by day the reputation of Maidoc for sanctity spread through the land of the Britons, and his prayers were sought for even in the courts of princes. At this time there were continual hostilities between the Britons and Saxons. It was during one of these many wars, when the Saxons had made an incursion into Wales, that the British leaders sent to St. David asking him to let Maidoc come to them, to bless themselves and their arms. St. David consented, and our saint went to a place whence he had a view of the two armies. It happened that the Saxons had entered the country unexpectedly, and the British were but ill-prepared for the combat. But so efficacious were the prayers of our saint, that the British achieved a glorious victory. Nay, more. As long as Maidoc remained at Menevia the Saxons made no further inroads into Wales. They feared the power of his prayers with God.

Maidoc passed many years in St. David's monastery. He had not, however, forgotten that the scene of his public life was to be the south of Ireland; and so, now that he was fully trained in the monastic life, with the blessing of St. David, and accompanied by a body of disciples from Menevia, he set sail from Milford Haven, and landed in the territory of

Hy-Kinsellagh.¹ He found the country near the coast in a wild and lawless state—in fact, a body of plunderers, led by a man of position in the neighbourhood, met them as they neared the shore, intending, as was their custom with strangers landing on the coast, to rob, and perhaps murder them. But the sight of the man of God and his disciples seems to have appealed to their better nature. Instead of attacking the monks, they assisted them to disembark. They afterwards saw more of the holy Maidoc; they were converted from their lawless mode of life, and they gave our saint two plots of ground, upon which he erected churches for the convenience of the neighbourhood.

Before Maidoc had been long in Ireland he seems to have repented that he did not ask St. David to appoint some one under whose jurisdiction he and his disciples should be.² In his humility he did not realize that he himself was to be the father of many monasteries, and the director of a multitude of saints. However, he received light upon the subject from God, and gave up the idea he entertained of returning to Wales to consult St. David on the matter. He determined, however, to take as his spiritual director St. Molua, a holy and learned monk, whom he may have known at the school of Clonard, and who was founder—so it is said—of no less than one hundred monasteries.³

The life upon which he was now entering was to be one of great labour and activity. Within the next few years, in fact, he founded a very large number of monasteries, though, unfortunately, of most of them we have no record. Not long after his return from Britain he crossed the river Barrow, and entered the territory of the Desii, which is practically co-extensive with the county of Waterford.⁴ Here he

¹ Ware, *History, &c., of Ireland*, vol. i., page 60, including most of the county Wexford.

² The words in the *Life*, that he wanted St. David to chose a confessor for him do not seem correct. (Cf. Bollandists, Jan. 31, note to chap. xix.) The words given in the life printed in the *Camb.-British Saints* seem more likely (page 238). Here it is said he wanted David to choose for him “amicum anime.”

³ Lanigan, ii., 206.

⁴ Ware, vol. i., page 49.

founded the cell or monastery of Disert-Nairbe, which is, according to Archdall,¹ the modern Bolhendesart, in the parish of Desert. He remained for some time at his new foundation, and then returned to Hy-Kinsellagh, the true field of his labours. One of the most celebrated of his establishments in this part of the country was the abbey of Clonemore, situated in the barony of Bantry, near the Slaney, and about two miles from Enniscorthy.² Over this monastery he placed one of his disciples, Dicolla Garbhir, and it maintained its reputation for many centuries.

At this period Bran Dubh, a man of great energy and ability, was ruler of Hy-Kinsellagh. His reputation had already spread throughout Ireland, and for some reason or other he had incurred the odium of the chief kings of the country. The result was that about this time, Aidus, supreme king of Erin, and son of Ainmire, who had had Maidoc as a hostage in his hands, was now approaching with a large force to ravage the territory of Bran Dubh. Maidoc was dwelling at the time at the abbey of Clonemore, and such was his reputation for sanctity and force of character, that people congregated to him from all sides for protection. Their confidence was not misplaced. Aidus marched towards the monastery; but misfortune befell him from the very beginning. It is said that Maidoc made a mark with his staff upon the ground, and that a soldier, having scoffingly passed over it, fell dead on the spot. At all events, king Aidus recognised that heaven was against him, and retreated, exclaiming that it was useless to strive against God. Before long, however, his hostility to the chief of the Hy-Kinsellagh prevailed over his fear of God. Assembling again a powerful force from Leinster, Munster, Connaught, and Tyrconnel, he marched southwards, with the intention of driving Bran Dubh from his territory. But the strategical resources of the southern king and the powerful prayers of Maidoc were too much for Aidus. He was completely

¹ *Monasticon Hibernicum*, page 685.

² Archdall, *Monasticon Hibernicum*, page 734.

defeated, and slain with a large number of the noblest of his followers. This was in the year 594.¹

Bran Dubh now became king, not only of Leinster, but of the greater part of Ireland. He does not appear to have devoted much attention to religious matters, and, in fact, the greater part of his time was taken up with wars and quarrels with other kingdoms. Not long, however, after he had become king of Leinster he fell ill, and in the delirium of his sickness, as he lay in his camp by the river Slaney, he seemed to see great monsters trying to devour him. Then a priest of beautiful and joyful countenance seemed to him to come and rescue him from destruction. After a time the king grew better, and he was moved to a place by the sea-side called Inbher-Crainchium, still very weak and sickly. Then one of his friends advised him to send to the holy man, Maidoc, for some holy water. The idea of having recourse to the man of God pleased the king; but he determined, weak as he was, to go himself to St. Maidoc. When he came into the presence of our saint he was struck with astonishment at seeing that he was the very same in appearance as the holy priest who in his illness had rescued him from the horrid monster. Bran Dubh had had time for reflection during his long illness; his interview with Maidoc completed the work of conversion within him. He now confessed to the saint the wicked life he had been leading. He expressed his willingness to make reparation for the wrongs he had committed. The saint on his side prayed to God for him, and healed him from his infirmity.

During the remainder of his life Bran Dubh was a sincere and devoted friend of our saint. He bestowed large donations upon him for ecclesiastical purposes, and in the year 598² made over to him some land at the modern town of Ferns, on the Bann, five miles from Enniscorthy, to build a monastery upon. Nor was he content with doing so much. He had a synod convoked of the bishops of the

¹ A full account of the defeat and death of king Aidus is given in the *Annals of the Four Masters* (Donovan), vol. i., page 218, note h.

² Cf. Ware, *Bishops*, page 436; Archdall, page 742.

province of Leinster, to which there came not only the prelates of the Church, but also the princes of the kingdom. There it was decided by king, bishops, and people, that Ferns should be erected into a new episcopal see, and that it should be in the future the archiepiscopal see of the province of Leinster. Maidoc was then unanimously chosen, and consecrated first archbishop of the new diocese.

It was about this time, shortly after he had become bishop of Ferns, that Maidoc went to visit his old master, David, at Menevia; for Maidoc became bishop in the year 598, and David died before the end of the century. Hence, as the visit took place after our saint had received the episcopal dignity, it must have been about this time. St. David knew that his end was at hand, and as he was anxious to see his beloved disciple once more before he died, he sent a request to him to come and visit him at Menevia. The request reached Maidoc at a busy time, for he was still new to the important office he had received. Still, he could not refuse the request of his old abbot; and, moreover, it was a real pleasure to him to return once more to his old monastic home. He had not forgotten the lessons of virtue he had learnt in the Vale of Ross, but had given the holy rule of St. David, or else one very similar to it, to be observed in the many monasteries he had established. No doubt, too, there were many points connected with the government of his monasteries and the episcopal office, upon which Maidoc was glad of an opportunity to consult St. David. Certainly we know that he remained a long time at Menevia, and that he and the great Welsh saint had prolonged conversations together on spiritual affairs. Nor did Maidoc depart till the call of duty imperatively demanded his return. Then he bade adieu to his venerable friend, and set out for Ireland,

¹ Before this time the archiepiscopal see had been at Sletty, afterwards it was at Kildare. Lanigan (vol. i., chap. vi., note 67) thinks that the archbishops of those days (except Armagh) were not, strictly speaking, metropolitans. Dr. Todd suggests that perhaps archbishop in this and similar passages is only a mistranslation of the Irish *ard-epsco*p—a chief or eminent bishop, pp. 14-16.

fortified with his blessing. Very few weeks after his departure, David went to receive the reward of his labours.

The holy bishop of Ferns lost another valued friend in the first year of the seventh century. Bran Dabh, king of Leinster, died in the year 601.¹ The Hy-Nials had long been waiting for a chance to avenge the defeat and death of their kinsman Aidus, king of Erin. At length, in the year 601, the longed-for opportunity presented itself, and the powerful northern family made an incursion in force into the province of Leinster. The battle was fought at a place called Slaibne, in which Bran-Dubh was completely defeated. The king escaped from the battle, but was afterwards traitorously assassinated by a nobleman of Leinster. Maidoc was much grieved at the miserable death of his friend and benefactor. It is recorded in his life (chap. xlv.) that he recalled the good king to life for a short while by the power of his intercession. Then it is related that Bran-Dubh, having confessed his sins and received with great fervour the Holy Viaticum, departed to receive the crown of the just. His body was deposited, according to his own request, in the Cathedral of Ferns.²

For upwards of thirty years Maidoc held the episcopal see of Ferns. Beside the cathedral he had built a large monastery, in which, whenever the duties of his office allowed, he lived, and led a life of labour and mortification. That the abbey of Ferns was an extensive one is clear, from the fact that on one occasion Bran-Dubh, coming to visit our saint, found him labouring at the harvest with one hundred and fifty of the brethren.³ The humility and mutual charity of the community were a source of edification to all that knew them. The rule was, no doubt, if not the same as that practised at Menevia, one very closely resembling it; and Maidoc himself, who had learnt to love that rule during his stay in Wales, claimed no exemptions from its severity. That he joined the brethren in their watchings and prayer, it is unnecessary to say. He fasted much. Indeed, it was his

¹ *Annals of the Four Masters.*

² Archdall attributes this event to the year 601. Lanigan (vol ii, page 338) to 602.

³ *Life*, chap. xxxvii.

custom when he wanted any special gift from God to abstain from food;¹ and on one occasion he is said to have taken no nourishment for forty days.² Moreover, encumbered though he was with the charge of his diocese, the spiritual care of the province of Leinster, and the direction of a large number of monasteries, he joined the monks at their manual labour. He took his part in sowing the harvest;³ he planted fruit-trees;⁴ he sowed seed in the fields;⁵ he at times, too, took upon himself the tedious labour of copying manuscripts.⁶ In a word, he taught the religious under his charge by example as well as by precept.

Bishop Maidoc was on terms of intimacy with many of the great saints of his day. For St. Molua, who was his spiritual director, he had the most profound esteem, and he journeyed from time to time to his monastery of Clonfert-Mulloe, in the King's County, to consult him. It is not unlikely that the friendship of these holy men began at the school of Clonard; for, in all probability, St. Molua was there at the same time as our saint.⁷ During one of the journeys of St. Maidoc to visit St. Molua it is related that, as he was passing by the convent of Cluain-Chreduil,⁸ a foundation of St. Ida, called the St. Brigid of Munster, he restored to life one of the nuns of the convent who had just died, and was much beloved by the holy abbess. "All that heard of, or were witnesses of, so great a miracle," says the biographer of our saint, "gave praise to God."

St. Columba, too, the great apostle and abbot of Iona, was well known to St. Maidoc. Both had been brought up at Clonard, though, no doubt, St. Columba had left the school before St. Maidoc arrived. No account is left of any meeting between these holy men in their lifetime, but it is related that Maidoc received a supernatural intimation of the death of St. Columba, and that he was a witness of the triumphant entrance of that great saint into the kingdom of heaven.

Another holy man with whom our saint was on intimate

¹ *Vita*, chap. xxxvi.

⁴ Chap. lvi.

⁷ *Lanigan*, vol. ii., 205.

² Chap. xxxiv.

⁵ Chap. xlvii.

³ Chap. xxxvii.

⁶ Chap. xli.

⁸ In *Hy-Conuail*, i.e., part of Limerick. *Ware*, vol. i., page 50.

terms was St. Munna, founder of the great abbey of Teagh Munæ, now Tagmon, in the county Wexford. To this monastery the holy bishop often went, and he was always received with joy by the abbot and his community. It was during one of these visits, whilst Maidoc and his friend were together in the Church, that he was the recipient of a favour similar to one of which we read in St. Gregory's life of the great St. Benedict. Suddenly the range of his vision was enlarged, and he was able to see the whole earth lying revealed before his eyes.

These are but a few out of the great host of St. Maidoc's friends. He was beloved by all that met him, and they were numberless, for the many responsibilities he had in his diocese, in his province, and in his monasteries, made it necessary for him to travel much through the country. But his labours were not confined to spiritual things. He was regarded in a special way as the protector of the kingdom of Leinster. Through his prayers and assistance the kingdom had attained to its present position in the days of the late king Bran-Dabh. Now, therefore, both princes and people looked to him for assistance in times of trouble. Nor was he ever wanting to them in their difficulties. Some time after the death of Aidus, king of Erin, his son Cuasgius had marched into Leinster with an army to avenge his death. Cuasgius was, however, himself defeated. This was a fresh reason for hostility between the princes of the north and the king of Leinster. Accordingly, the king of Erin, in alliance with the kings of Ulster and Connaught marched into Leinster at the head of twenty-four thousand men, striking dread into the hearts of the men of Leinster. Their king had recourse to the holy bishop Maidoc. Nor did he fail to lend assistance. Bidding the king to be of good heart, and go boldly to the fight, he himself had recourse to God. That night he spent in fervent prayer before the altar. Next day the battle was fought, and ended in the ignominious defeat of the invading army. The allied kings had to seek safety in an inglorious flight.

Considerations of space make it impossible for us to enter into the numerous miracles recorded of our saint during

his lifetime and after his death. A few we have referred to. Suffice it to say, that from his earliest years he seems to have been gifted by God with supernatural powers; especially so after he had received the episcopal dignity. He healed the sick; he raised the dead to life; he had the power of multiplying food in cases of need. He discomfited his enemies by sudden and terrible punishments; he was able to journey with safety and wonderful rapidity at times over land and sea; in a word, God illustrated the virtue of his servant, by according to him a marvellous power over the laws of nature.

Maidoc ended as he had begun. To the end he led a life of prayer, labour, and mortification; and finally, as his biographer relates, "having built many churches and performed many miracles, he departed to Christ by a most happy death." This was in the year 632.¹ His body was deposited in his cathedral, and his memory is revered not only in Ireland, but also in Wales, which he enlightened for many years by his virtues. The noblest monument of his zeal is the diocese of Ferns, which can point to a succession of Catholic bishops since his day, for a period of nearly one thousand three hundred years, and which still maintains intact the purity of the Catholic faith.

J. A. HOWLETT, O.S.B.

¹ Cf. Ussher, Ware, Archdall, Lanigan, &c. *The Four Masters* has 624.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN
HENRY NEWMAN, DURING HIS LIFE IN THE
ENGLISH CHURCH.¹—II.

IN our first notice of these volumes of Cardinal Newman's Anglican letters, we left him at the time where, after his severe illness in Sicily, he returns to England, penetrated with the idea that "God has a work for me to do." The direction which the work is to take is soon revealed and made evident. In 1833 the Established Religion seemed in a critical position. Newman writes :—

"It was the moment when the fears for the Church, which had long been growing, and which arose not merely from the designs, avowed or surmised, of her enemies, but from the helplessness of her friends, had led at length to the resolution of a few brave and zealous men to speak out and act. Ten Irish bishoprics had been at a sweep suppressed, and Church people were told to be thankful that things were no worse."

Amongst these brave and zealous men, it is needless to say, Newman was the foremost.

On July 14th, 1833, Keble preached his celebrated assize sermon, entitled "National Apostasy," and on this event Newman ever looked as the commencement of the Tractarian movement. It was shortly followed by several meetings of like-minded clergymen, the best-known among them being Newman, Keble, and Hurrell Froude (Pusey only joined the movement later on), in which two plans were discussed for arousing the religious instincts of English Churchmen, and stirring them out of the death-like apathy which was imperilling the existence of their body. These plans were, the formation of an association for the defence of the Anglican Church, and the idea of issuing a series of doctrinal and devotional pamphlets. As to the first scheme, we hear little more of it in these letters; the second resulted in the publication of the famous "Tracts for the Times."

Although, perhaps, hardly realizing the full extent of the

¹ Edited by Anne Mozley. 2 Vols. London; Longmans. 1891.

revolution in the Church of England which they were anxious to bring about, and which, as a fact, from one point of view, they actually accomplished, yet, from the first, the Tractarians admitted that their scheme was a bold one. It was none other than to work a radical change in the religion of their country; to force a Catholic meaning into every ambiguous formulary; and to ignore the Protestantism which for centuries their Church had been supposed to teach—in fact, had taught. Now, as we all know, the exact meaning of words lies in the interpretation attached to them; and if this is suddenly changed from one point to its exact opposite, a startling difference in the effect of the teaching of such words ensues. Over and above the change of meaning of the Anglican formularies which was to be brought about by the teaching of the Tracts, there was also much either taught by, or implied in, the Prayer-book, which, at this date, was ignored by the clergy and the laity alike; and it was desired also to bring back such teaching into the practical life of English Churchmen. Hurrell Froude was not far wrong when, at an early meeting of Tractarians, he exclaimed, with perhaps truer prophetic vision than his associates: “I don’t see why we should disguise from ourselves that our object is to dictate to the clergy of this country.”

Even Newman himself, however, seems to have foreseen great difficulties in un-Protestantising his fellow-countrymen, and in persuading them that, doubt it as they might, their Church was really Catholic; for he writes: “We floored so miserably at the Reformation, that, though the Church ground *is* defensible, yet the edge of truth is so fine, no plain man can see it.” Nor did outsiders anticipate great success for the party. Bunsen, a keen though an unsympathetic critic, on reading Newman’s *History of the Arians*, in which his Tractarian views were prominent, says that, should the party succeed in leavening the whole of England with their teaching, they would but be “introducing Popery without authority, Protestantism without liberty, Catholicism without universality, and Evangelicism without spirituality.” In fact, the Tractarian scheme was likely to raise an amount of

opposition, the force of which was well-nigh incalculable. Every religious instinct in the England of those days was antagonistic to the Catholic Church, and these instincts were quite incapable of drawing the fine line between what Newman called "Roman," as distinct from "Catholic" teaching. He was, therefore, confronted with the full force of the English prejudice against the Church, and, of course, entirely unsupported by the Catholic Church, which, in spite of popular opinion to the contrary, he opposed.

The storm was not, however, aroused quite at first, and Newman's new and startling teaching did not, in its earliest days, meet with great opposition. His attitude towards the bishops was one of complete submission. In directing the tone to be taken in one of the first tracts, he writes:—"Recollect that we are supporting the bishops; enlarge on the unfairness of leaving them to bear the brunt of the battle." A little later on, he asserts his willingness to submit at once to any advice or correction which they might offer, and even, should they so desire, to confine the subjects of the tracts entirely to such as concern the Creeds and the Thirty-Nine Articles. Indeed, even later, when he was being most keenly opposed, and was often placed in cruelly false positions, we never detect any sign of the defiant and rebellious spirit which has disfigured so much zealous and excellent work in those who profess to-day to be the Anglican representatives of Tractarian teaching. Newman's attitude, through a very trying period of misrepresentation, is above criticism.

Early in the movement, it suffered the loss of one who, had he lived longer, might have greatly influenced its course. In February, 1836, Hurrell Froude died, and his death was not only of public moment, but was also a deep personal sorrow to Newman. As we stated last month, it was in order that Froude should escape an English winter, that he and Newman went abroad in 1833. No cure of his illness, however, resulted from the trip, and during the three following years his health gradually declined; and although he eagerly joined in the scheme for writing the early tracts, he did not live to see the results which speedily followed on their issue.

The movement went on, in spite of his loss, but its course was probably less brilliant for the extinction of his energizing presence, and, at the outset, he seemed to those with whom he worked as absolutely essential to the original impulse which set them going. As Miss Mozley writes: "They cannot imagine the start without his forwarding, impelling look and voice." He was, at this date, Newman's dearest friend, and the grief the latter experienced at his death is pathetically described in a letter to Mr. Bowden:—

"He has been so very dear to me [writes Newman], that it is an effort to me to reflect on my own thoughts about him. I can never have a greater loss, looking on the whole of my life. . . . I never, on the whole, fell in with so gifted a person. In variety and perfection of gifts he far exceeded even Keble."

The year 1836 seems to have been a momentous one in Newman's life, and not alone for the loss of Froude, nor even for that of his mother, which followed closely on it. He himself tabulates nine important events of this year, bracketing them together under the heading: "A New Scene Opens." Amongst these we note, "My Knowing and Using the Breviary;" and again, "My Writing against the Church of Rome." Although he had good cause for dejection at this time, it is in this year that he writes to his sister, he is so full of work that he has little time for sadness. He owns to feeling solitary, but adds: "I never feel so near heaven as then. . . I am not more lonely than I have been for a long while. God intends me to be lonely; He has so framed my mind that I am in a great measure beyond the sympathy of other people, and thrown upon Himself."

At this date, although he might lack sympathy, he had not yet to complain of absolute misunderstanding. The tracts were following one another with rapidity; they were welcomed and read with interest; the effect of their teaching was already apparent, and Tractarian views were spreading in a manner which surprised even their promoters. All was promising, and Newman's letters sound a glad, even a triumphant, note. Conscious of his loyalty to the Church of England, only anxious to arouse and revivify her, with no mistrust as to his position,

he could cheerfully suffer to be opposed by those from whom he frankly and avowedly differed ; and at this date no sadness mingles with his anxiety to spread his opinions. Later on, the tone of his letters changes sensibly, a change caused even less by the tardily-avowed opposition of the Anglican authorities than by the spirit of distrust in his own self, which further study has aroused. It is this mistrust in his own loyalty to the Anglican Church which weighs him down so heavily, and makes the later letters in this volume so sad and pitiful that we almost feel that we—as more or less indifferent spectators—have no right to be witnesses of such keen suffering, or to be admitted to the sight of the intolerable anguish of a soul awakening to the fact that, though all unconsciously, he has been using God's best gifts against and not in His service. It has been well said that our sorrow is the inverted image of our nobleness ; and in nothing does Newman's nobility stand forth more prominently than in the trying years when he lay on his "Anglican death-bed."

It is in August, 1838, that we begin to hear the first murmurings of disapproval, then only faint and distant, but which soon were to engulf Newman and so many of his friends. At that date we have a letter from Newman to Keble, in which he writes that he has just been listening to his bishop's charge, and that in it he had discovered a certain, though not a strong disapproval of the tracts and their tendency. The bishop, Newman writes, alludes to a remarkable development, both in matters of discipline and of doctrine, and states that he had received many anonymous letters charging the Tractarian party with Romanising ; and that, although, on investigating these charges, he finds nothing to corroborate such accusations, yet he regrets some words and expressions in the tracts, which, though used innocently by the writers, were likely to lead others into error. Feeble as this censure was, it touched Newman's sensitiveness to the quick, and it is on this occasion that he used the oft-quoted, though we fear by Anglicans little-heeded, words : " A bishop's lightest word, *ex cathedra*, is heavy." He himself wishes to discontinue the tracts forthwith. He writes at

once to his archdeacon, proposing to stop their issue; and, further, that if the bishop will only designate such amongst those already published as meet with his disapproval, he (Newman) will withdraw them from circulation. This is more than the bishop anticipated, or even wished. His position was a difficult one, so difficult that we find it no easy task even to make it intelligible to our readers. He personally liked and respected Newman, knowing him too well to suspect him capable of equivocal teaching, of saying less than he intended to mean, or of any want of straightforwardness—accusations of which were freely banded about; and he also approved decidedly of much that was in the tracts. But a bishop of the Establishment has much to think of besides his own individual tastes and opinions, and he is bound to give heed even to anonymous accusations of a tendency to the unpopular side supposed to be expoused by the tracts. The words the “Established Church” mean a religion consisting of such an innumerable number of opinions and of different shades of opinion, that an Anglican bishop’s lot does not fall in easy places, and to avoid mistakes he must be wary. In the year 1838, and even to-day, many forms of opinion sufficiently startling might pass unnoticed, provided the orthodox Protestantism of the Church of England was unassailed. Unfortunately, this was the very point which Newman’s enemies had seized on, and it was of Romanising that he was accused. Here the bishop felt that he might imperil his own influence if, whilst expressing approval of much which really commended itself to him, he did not so far yield to the popular outcry against the tracts by expressing some vague disapproval. Newman was far too sensitive to the censure of his superiors to submit easily to public reproof, even whilst in private he met with sympathy and encouragement. The tracts spoke with no hesitating voice of the authority of a bishop, and of the obedience and deference which is due to his office, and Newman had no disposition to allow himself to be placed in the false position of one who, whilst he theoretically enunciated decided views, in his own conduct ignored them. The whole strength of his position lay in his consistency; his life

and his teaching must be in harmony; and he, therefore, only required to be told his bishop's wishes in order to comply with them. Such definite and exact obedience did not suit his lordship; he had no wish to force Newman to discontinue the tracts, but he equally disliked that it should be supposed that he approved of them. The result was that whilst the "charge" was made public, the sympathetic and kind words with which he encouraged Newman were spoken in private, thus placing him (Newman) in a position the difficulty of which he felt keenly. He himself tells us, that at this time his influence stood higher than at any other time; but, judging from his letters, we should say that the meridian of his Anglican life is now past. A certain misgiving, at first faint as a shadow, is becoming evident; he suffers from the extreme tension of the times, the difficulty of satisfying all who are looking up to him as their guide daily becomes more apparent, whilst his share in the movement is criticized far and wide. In November, 1838, Newman writes a long letter to Keble, which is hardly one which a man would send who felt well satisfied with the world. In his letter he offers to be guided entirely by Keble's decision in any differences that may have arisen, and he continues:—

"Now, this being understood, may I not fairly ask for some little confidence in me, as to what, under these voluntary restrictions, I do? People should really put themselves into my place, and consider how the appearance of suspicion, jealousy, and discontent is likely to affect one who is most conscious that everything he does is imperfect, and, therefore, soon begins so to suspect everything he does as to have no heart and little power to do anything at all. Anyone can fancy the effect which the presence of ill-disposed spectators would have on some artist or operator engaged in a delicate experiment. Is such conduct kind towards me? Is it feeling? If I ought to stop, I am ready to stop; but do not in the same breath chide me, for instance, for thinking of stopping the tracts, and then be severe on the tracts which are actually published. If I am to proceed, I must be taken for what I am—not agreeing, perhaps, altogether with those who criticize me, but still, I suppose, on the whole, subserving rather than not what they consider right ends. This I feel, that if I am met with loud remonstrances before gentle hints are tried, and if suspicions go before proofs, I shall very soon be silenced, whether people wish it or no."

To this letter is affixed, by Newman, a note in 1885: "This was the last occasion on which I could prefer a claim for *confidence*. The very next autumn my misgivings began." Words of ominous meaning; and we have now to trace the steps, one by one, which led to the great change impending, and to see how Newman came to realize the futility of all his hopes, the necessity for leaving the body which he had been so bravely trying to reform, and of taking rank with those whom he had ever looked on as buried in dark error. Our task is made the more difficult by the fragmentary nature of the tale as it is told in these volumes. A stray expression here and there, often in letters dealing mainly with other topics, a growing sadness and depression as his Catholic theories are daily contradicted by the evidently Protestant acts of his Church, are of moment as marking a gradual change: yet as a whole, if we compare the story of Newman's conversion as told in his "*Letters*," with its consecutive history in the *Apologia*, we realize how fortunate we are in possessing a work which tells us in a way none can question, how the important change was worked out. His conversion has been attributed to various causes; both good and bad reasons have been given for the change; and there is evidence in these letters that many of which we hear, were not without their share of influence. Still, on the whole, we gather that one, and one only, motive brought about the happy result. We see that distrust of those in authority, though not without a certain effect, was not the cause; and that the difficulty of being placed in a logical dilemma by shrewd minds, who often saw that Newman's premises led further than he suspected, could have been overcome. Nor would dissatisfaction at such acts of the Establishment as the Hampden and Jerusalem bishoprics, though painful episodes, have led to further action, but for the steadily-growing belief—at first a mere disquieting and alarming impression, but with deeper study growing into a firm conviction—that outside the Church of Rome there is no consistent Christian body whatsoever; that as she stood in the days of the Donatists and Monophysites, so she was found through the ever-lengthening

years, and so she stands to-day, Christ's one and only Church.

It was a few months after the letter to Keble (quoted above) was written, in which Newman insists that confidence must be placed in him; that he received what he calls "the first real hit from Romanism that has happened to me;" and he adds: "It is no laughing matter; I will not blink the question; so be it." The occasion of these first misgivings was the study of an article by Dr. Wiseman in the *Dublin Review*, on the early controversies of the Church with the Monophysites and the Donatists; and, as we learn, though far more fully from the *Apologia* than from these letters, these misgivings were never stifled or laid to rest; but, with study and reflection, became more and more active, and at length landed Newman safely in the haven of peace and rest in which the second half of his life was passed.

Henry W. Wilberforce, one of those who, "leaving all things," eventually followed in Newman's footsteps, has given us a record of his feelings when first confronted with the fear of Newman's change of religion. It is worth notice, as an example of the power the truth will exercise, when once firmly grasped, in dispelling prejudice, and of the courageous manner in which many of the converts of 1845 broke with their early teaching. The evidence required to shake the convictions of one who could write as below, must have been of the strongest:—

"It was in the beginning of October, 1839, that he made the astounding confidence, mentioning the two subjects which had inspired the doubt—the position of St. Leo in the Monophysite controversy, and the principle *securus judicat orbis terrarum* in that of the Donatists. He said that he felt confident that when he returned to his rooms, and was able fully and calmly to consider the whole matter, he should see his way completely out of the difficulty. But he said: 'I cannot conceal from myself that, for the first time since I began the study of theology, a vista has been opened before me, to the end of which I do not see.' He was walking in the New Forest, and he borrowed the form of his expression from the surrounding scenery. His companion, upon whom such a fear came like a thunderstroke, expressed his hope that Mr. Newman might die rather than take such a step.

He replied, with deep earnestness, that he had thought, if ever the time should come when he was in serious danger, of asking his friends to pray, that, if it was not indeed the will of God, he might be taken away before he did it."

As we have just remarked, Newman's "calm and full" consideration does not improve matters; and soon difficulty follows quickly on difficulty, and the end of the vista yearly becomes more evident. Even his own particular work does but hasten the end. As is well known, he had both studied the Fathers and published editions of their works with the view of supporting such Catholic doctrines as Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, Apostolic Succession, and others of a kindred nature—doctrines which he imagined could be held by Anglicans, and which he distinguished as "Catholic," and as differing from others (which generally were simply their logical development) which he labelled "Roman." The former had a certain amount of authority in the Establishment as having been taught by the Caroline divines of the English Church; and Newman wished to make them more generally known and accepted, by showing that they rested on the firm basis of patristic teaching. The Anglican divines were to be supported by the Fathers, and Newman hoped that his countrymen would find their united teaching irresistible. Once, however, having appealed to the Fathers as the ground on which his teaching rested, so honest a mind as Newman's could not ignore their teaching when it went further than his argument required. He could not quote them for his own purpose, but remain indifferent to what he found elsewhere in their writings, even when it reached the point which till now he had considered sheer "Romanism." In November, 1839, he writes of others what we expect he must have been himself experiencing:—

"Then the question of the Fathers is getting more and more anxious. For certain persons will not find in them just what they expected. People seem to have thought they contained nothing but the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, Apostolical Succession, Canonicity of Scripture, and the like. Hence, many have embraced the principle of appeal to them with this view. Now they are beginning to be undeceived."

In 1840 Newman is seriously depressed by the state not only of the religious world, but also of the tone he finds prevalent amongst both intellectual and scientific people. Carlyle, Arnold, and Milman, politicians, geologists, and political economists, seem uniting to bring about a deplorable state of things :—

“Everything is miserable [he writes]. I expect a great attack upon the Bible . . . indeed, I have long expected it . . . But this is not all. I begin to have serious apprehensions lest any religious body is strong enough to withstand the league of evil but the Roman Church . . . Certainly, the way good principles have shot up is wonderful; but I am not clear they are not tending to Rome.”

Such an admission must have cost Newman dear. Was not this the very thing that his enemies had been continually insisting on; and although he slightly qualified his assertion later on in the letter, it is ominous of what is to follow.

It was also in this year (1840) that Newman commenced building what he styles a “monastic house,” at his country living of Littlemore. This living was attached to that of St. Mary’s, Oxford, and was a source of great interest to Newman and to his mother and sisters, who settled there after his father’s death. In this same year he purchased some nine or ten acres at Littlemore, and there built a dwelling-house which was to be inhabited by men from Oxford, who, sharing his opinions, wished to give themselves to a regular life of religion and study. When the cares and fretting of Oxford life became overpowering, Newman found a welcome retreat in this abode; and as his doubts and difficulties became more perplexing and overwhelming, his visits to Littlemore lengthen, till, during the last years of his Anglican life, when he had relinquished all preferment in the Establishment, it became his permanent home, and at last it was the scene of his reception into the Catholic Church.

The next few years are pregnant with important issues, and, although, as we have seen, Newman found much occasion for dissatisfaction as early as the year 1840, it was in 1841 that

commenced the series of events which may be considered the outward and impersonal causes, over and above the inward conviction which God's grace was forming within him, and which, combined with such events, brought about the happy result with which we are familiar. In 1841 Newman wrote his famous Tract Ninety, which, as is well known, was concerned with the possibility of interpreting the decidedly Protestant Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Prayer-book in a Catholic sense. He seems to have been quite unprepared for the excitement which followed its publication, and to have been far from expecting that it would create any special interest. Nor, apparently, did Keble, to whom Newman showed it, expect any stir to result, for he allowed it to pass without any further criticism. More than one circumstance, however, combined to bring this tract into special notice. By the time it was published, the movement was creating much interest; the daily papers were busy discussing "Puseyism," as it was now called; and, although its earnestness was recognised, and the danger of mistaking it for an affair of mere posture and ceremony was admitted, yet, on the whole, it met with little popular favour. The subject was also discussed in Parliament, on the occasion of one of the ever-recurring debates on the grant to Maynooth College. This was made the occasion of an attack on the Oxford party, wherein, as it was stated, were to be found those who, whilst they were paid to teach Protestantism, were doing their best to bring the Establishment into harmony with Rome. It was at this moment of public excitement, when the world was fully alive and anxious to understand all that was going on at Oxford, and when people were frightened and confused by the tone of the papers, and by the debates in Parliament, that Tract Ninety appeared. We cannot be surprised that, instead of allaying, it further excited the public mind. Its subtle distinctions, we must fairly admit, were enough to puzzle plain people. The Thirty-Nine Articles had always been considered a bulwark of Protestantism, especially against such errors of Rome as the doctrine of the Mass, the Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, and others of a like nature, which, whilst the Tractarians called "Romanism," as held by us,

yet from their study of the Fathers they found no system, professing to be Catholic, could exclude from its teaching. In some form or other they must be recognised. The difficulty was met with great ingenuity; and Newman endeavoured to prove that the Articles were so framed as only to condemn certain popular abuses in the Church of Rome; and that their language admitted of an interpretation which was in harmony with Catholic teaching.

Such fine shades of meaning and such subtle distinctions, were, however, altogether beyond the somewhat dense vision of the ordinary Englishman. His intellectual strong point is not the power of distinguishing between delicate differences; and he is somewhat contemptuous of what he calls hair-splitting; and a storm such as the Establishment has seldom witnessed suddenly arose. The tutors, professors, and heads of houses, all Oxford, indeed all England, seem to have been alarmed, and to have rushed into hasty action, the details of which it is now unnecessary to follow. As is well known from his own pen, Newman considered his position in the movement so damaged that his legitimate influence was at an end, and he retired to Littlemore. Though the end was not yet, we may call this move its beginning. The Roman spectre, far from being laid, was daily becoming more importunate; and besides, its disquieting warnings, misrepresentations and misunderstandings from his own people, cause a constant worry. Anglicans to-day fondly imagine that had Newman at this time been treated with more sympathy, they might have kept him in their ranks. This is, of course, a surmise from which we differ, believing that, all along, God's finger was on him, and that sooner or later He would have claimed him for His own. There is, however, no denying that had the Anglican body studied how best to drive a sensitive, yet loyal man from their Church, they could have devised few better methods than those practised on Newman. As he tells us in the *Apologia* :—

“After Tract Ninety, the Protestant world would not let me alone. They pursued me in the public journals to Littlemore. Reports of all kinds were circulated about me. Inquiries why did I go to Littlemore at all? For no good purpose, certainly;

I dare not tell why. Why, to be sure, it was hard that I should be obliged to say to the editors of newspapers, that I went up there to say my prayers. It was hard to have to tell the world in confidence that I had a certain doubt about the Anglican system, and could not at that moment resolve it, or say what would come of it. It was hard to have to confess that I had thought of giving up my living a year or two before, and that this was the first step to it. It was hard to have to plead that, for what I knew, my doubts would vanish if the newspapers would be so good as to give me time, and let me alone."

Although, on the whole, his own bishop treated him with kindness and consideration, yet, even he brings foolish reports seriously to his notice, asks for explanations, and seems to give heed to much, which, whilst it is mere silly gossip, is yet calculated to annoy Newman, and simply to drive him further and more quickly in the direction towards which his teaching was accused of leading. Throughout these trying years, however, Newman, though hurt and distrustful, and almost overwhelmed with doubts of his own position, and sorrow at the grief and perplexities which his doubts cause to his followers, yet never loses patience. From the first, he has strongly deprecated all hasty or precipitate action. No unconsidered step, no change made when smarting under misunderstanding, meets with his approval. The very attraction which many Protestants feel for the Catholic Church, in his advice to others, he urges should be resisted, and not allowed unduly to influence them in a change of religion. He will leave no stone unturned, nor will he relinquish all hope of the possibility of the Anglican Church being a part of the Catholic Church till every chance has been seriously examined and deliberately cast aside. The letters of these years show how reluctantly he gave up hope, how sadly he hoped against hope, that his early views might yet prove true.

It was whilst he was in this critical frame of mind, that the State and the Establishment combined to deal the final blow to his expectation of Catholicising his fellow-countrymen by means of the Church of England. Whilst he had spent years and labour untold in an endeavour to prove that she was Catholic, and had succeeded in persuading many, and

in half persuading himself, that he was right, the body he was experimenting upon suddenly awoke, by a slight effort righted herself, and by one act reasserted, in an unmistakable manner, the essentially Protestant nature of her character which the Tractarians had had the temerity to assail. This act was the appointment of an Anglican bishop to the See of Jerusalem, there to fraternize with Monophysites and Lutherans, Sabellians and Calvinists, and any other form of heresy, ancient or modern, which he might find on the spot.

As might be expected, this act wounded Newman deeply. Regarding it he writes in the *Apologia* :—

“ Looking back two years afterwards on the above-mentioned and other acts on the part of Anglican ecclesiastical authorities, I observed : ‘ Many a man might have held an abstract theory about the Catholic Church, to which it was difficult to adjust the Anglican ; might have admitted a suspicion, or even painful doubts about the latter, yet never have been impelled onwards, had our rulers preserved the quiescence of former years ; but, it is the corroboration of a present, living, and energetic heterodoxy, that realizes and makes such doubts practical ; it has been the recent speeches and acts of authorities, who had so long been tolerant of Protestant error, which has given to inquiry and theory its force and edge.’ ”

At the time he writes :—

“ It really does seem as if the bishops were doing their best to un-Catholicise us ; [and again], it cannot be denied that a great and anxious *experiment* is going on, whether our Church be, or be not, Catholic ; the issue may not be in our day. But I must be plain in saying, that if it does issue in Protestantism, I shall think it my duty to leave it.’ ”

We see from such words as these, how far even yet Newman was from realizing the nature of the faith which a Catholic places in his Church, a failing we may observe which is all but general with Anglicans. Catholic doctrines they can and often do accept one by one, and independently of each other ; not, however, on the ground that they are taught by the Church, but either because they can be proved from Scripture, or that they are in harmony with their early teaching, or attracted by their intrinsic beauty. But, should

such men be confronted by a doctrine resting on the same authority, but which repels instead of commending itself to them, we at once discover the foundation on which their imposing so-called Catholic edifice has been built. They not only oppose it resolutely, but they seem even unable to understand how a Catholic finds no difficulty in submitting his own opinion to that of the Church when and in whatsoever way she may ask it of him.

Although his visits to Littlemore were now so lengthy as to form almost a continuous residence there, it was not till February, 1842, that Newman retired there for good, and in the following year he ceased to preach at St. Mary's, Oxford, and indeed soon after to preach in the Establishment at all. In August, 1843, Father Lockhart, who at that time was one of the brotherhood at Littlemore, was received into the Church, an occurrence by which Newman feels to so great an extent compromised that he allowed it to fix the date of his resigning the living of St. Mary's. In writing to his sister, touching this step he says:—

“I am not so zealous a defender of the established and existing system of religion as I ought to be for such a post; [and a few days later he adds], the truth, then, is, I am not a good son enough of the Church of England to feel that I can in conscience hold preferment under her. I love the Church of Rome too well.”

The period, from September 17th to 25th, 1843, is, perhaps, the most eventful in Newman's life, if we except the one of his reception, in October, 1845. On the 17th he preached at St. Mary's, a sermon which was followed by a sleepless night, and a journey to London, where he went through the legal preliminaries necessary for resigning his living. He preached, however, once more in the University pulpit on the 24th. The 25th was spent at Littlemore, and on that day, for the last time, his voice was heard in an Anglican Church, speaking those touching words on the “parting of friends,” which few, even amongst those who best know and can realize how great has been his gain, how speedily his tears were turned into joy, can read unmoved. To those who, alas, refused to follow, from whom

the parting and severance were complete, and with whom he was never again united in a common faith, their unqualified sadness must be extreme. As one who can remember those days, writes, on no longer hearing Newman's voice in Oxford :—

“On these things, looking over an interval of five-and-twenty years, how vividly comes back the remembrance of the aching blank, the awful pause which fell on Oxford, when that voice had ceased, and we knew we should hear it no more. It was as when, to one kneeling by night, in the silence of some vast cathedral, the great bell tolling solemnly overhead has suddenly gone still. . . . Since then many voices of powerful teachers may have been heard, but none that ever penetrated the soul like his.”

Even now, however, Newman can announce no definite intention of joining the Church ; only he says : “I do so despair of the Church of England . . . and I am so drawn to the Church of Rome, that I think it *safer*, as a matter of honesty, *not* to keep my living.” The end, however, is fast approaching. Study had convinced his intellect ; all the action of his own Church had been disquieting ; the full conviction that it would be at the risk of his soul if he remained stationary was overwhelming. Such considerations as these were sufficiently powerful to withstand even the affectionate and tender pleadings of his sisters and friends not thus to desert them. No more touching letter exists in our language than that which Newman wrote, in answer to his sister's remonstrance, on March 15, 1845. Unfortunately, it is too long to quote. Indeed, the sense all these latter letters give us is one of an unnecessarily lengthened pain ; they represent a long and sorrowfully-drawn-out parting. We feel as if we were witnessing a scene, which, although all concerned dread its ending, those looking on can but wish to hasten. We might thus watch the leave-takings of a party of emigrants on board a ship. The sound of the warning bell is dreaded by all ; yet, an undue delay is but the lengthening of the most distressing of all human emotions. With Newman, the delay extends over months and years, and we can imagine that at last even his Anglican friends must have welcomed his action. In the end, it came

abruptly in a note to his sister. "This night Father Dominic, the Passionist, sleeps here. He does not know of my intention; but I shall ask him to receive me into what I believe to be 'the one Fold of the Redeemer.'" Thus he died to his past, and when we next open a volume of Newman's letters, they will tell us of a happy resurrection, of the long years which God vouchsafed to grant, and in which he worked in His Master's vineyard, happily called thither in his full manhood and vigour, both of intellect and body, and long years before even the eleventh hour had sounded.

CECIL CLAYTON.

HISTORY OF THE CEREMONIAL OF HOLY MASS.—II.

THE words immediately following those mentioned, that is to say, *Per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso, est tibi Deo Patri, in unitate Spiritus Sancti, omnis honor et gloria*, are, to my mind, after the words of consecration, the most solemn in the whole service, or in any liturgy or office. With the priest holding the sacred species in his hand, and making with the adorable Host the venerable sign of the cross over the consecrated cup, I cannot conceive anything more solemn, or any words more sublime. They seem to be an epitome of all worship and all adoration. What a treatise might be written on the inner meaning of these words! And how much would it not reveal to us of that *hidden life* in the tabernacle of the altar, where He is always "living to make intercession for us." "By Him, and with Him, and in Him, there accrues to God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, *all honour and glory*."

The introductory prayer, prefixed to the *Pater Noster*, has been of the greatest antiquity; perhaps as old as the introduction of the *Pater Noster* itself; but certainly existing at the time of St. Gregory. Of the *Pater Noster*, and of

the fitness of its insertion, there is no need to speak. The only prayer remaining to us, composed by our divine Lord Himself—if any prayer of man might be intermingled with the sacred mysteries, surely the prayer of the God-man might—and that, both from its intrinsic value, as well as from the sacredness of its author. Hence it is as old as the liturgy itself; and, as has been seen, whatever portions in the stress of penal times had to be omitted, it never was. Hence, too, in the service of the pre-sanctified on Good Friday, it is still retained.

The *Libera nos*, following the *Pater Noster*, is looked upon as an expansion of the *Sed Libera nos a malo* of the *Pater Noster*; its introduction is of uncertain date; but it is considered to be very ancient, since St. Jerome and St. Cyprian make mention of it.

Until the time of Pope St. Gregory, the breaking of the Host and the prayer, with the intermingling with the chalice, occupied an earlier place in the mass, immediately after the canon. From the revision of St. Gregory, the fraction with the *Pax Domini sit semper* is found where it stands at present, together with the accompanying ceremonies.

The triple invocation of the beautiful prayer, the *Agnus Dei*, dates from the time of Pope Sergius I., about 680. Each invocation ended alike; until in times of trouble in the Church, later on, as Innocent III. testifies, the ending *dona nobis pacem* was affixed to the third. The suitability of changing *miserere nobis* into *dona eis requiem* of the black mass, is evident; but under what circumstances, or at what time, the change took place, does not appear. Nor, again, is it well known when or why the first of the three prayers preceding the *Domine non sum dignus* has been omitted in masses for the dead. These three prayers are supposed to be very ancient; the last of which, on account of its being found in the mass of Good Friday, and because of its similarity to a prayer occupying a like place “in almost all the oriental liturgies,”¹ is supposed to be by far the most

¹Dr. Gasquet.

ancient. They were not generally in use until about the time of Innocent III., when he ordered them to be repeated as now; and about the same time the pathetic prayer of the centurion—*Domine non sum dignus*, came to be inserted, *i.e.*, towards the end of the middle ages.

We now come to a very important as well as interesting ceremony—that, namely, of administering and receiving Holy Communion. Our mode, at present, we know. The communicant, while kneeling, receives the sacred particle on the tongue. To that there are exceptions; if, for instance, a person is sick, the person receives it while lying in bed. If a priest receives, *modo laico*, he wears a stole around his neck.

In the early ages, instead of kneeling, the faithful were standing while receiving the Holy Communion. A tradition was, that it was standing the Apostles received the Holy Communion at the Last Supper; and nowadays no one but the Pope can so receive it. While they stood they rested the back of the right hand on the palm of the left; and in the open palm of the right, thus supported, they received the Sacred Host. Women covered their right hand with a veil or linen cloth, which was called *dominicale*, and was something akin to our *corporal*.

There will be found in the Roman Breviary, in the lessons within the octave of Corpus Christi, a description from St. Ambrose, of the ceremony and the prayer used when Holy Communion was being administered in the fourth century. The priest presented the Sacred Host, and said, *Corpus Domini*; to which the communicant answered, *Amen*. The priest presented the consecrated cup, and said, *Sanguis Christi*; and the recipient again answered, *Amen*.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem says:—"The faithful, making the left hand a throne for the right, which is about to receive the King, and hollowing the palm, receive the Body of Christ, while answering the *Amen*."

"The piety of the faithful [says Dr. Gasquet] led to various devout practices, such as applying the Sacred Host to their eyes before receiving, and signing their lips with the sign of the cross immediately after taking the Precious Blood—practices which

were commended by the Greek Fathers from Origen to Theodoret. but which were liable to abuses that led to their prohibition in the West." (*Dub. Rev.*, Oct., 1890.)

"As the communion of a whole congregation [says the author of the *Explanation of the Liturgy of the Mass*] took up a considerable time, appropriate psalms or canticles were sung in the intervals. The banquets of kings, and of the great ones of the earth, are always accompanied with singing and music; in like manner, the Christian temples resound with melodious accents during this sacred feast, to which God, as the Host, the Food, and the Guest, invited His children." (Page 302.)

Now it must be remembered that all who assisted at the Holy Sacrifice in early times, also received the Holy Communion; and that, furthermore, every day was a day of special devotion to them; so that we can understand how lovingly saints looked back upon

"That early Church, whose anthemed rites
Made earth like heaven. Her nights
Glorious and blest as day, with festive lights!"¹

In the Eastern Church, the psalm sung was the forty-first, which begins so beautifully and (for the occasion) so appropriately: "As the hart panteth after the fountains of water, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God." In the Western, it was the thirty-third: "I will bless the Lord at all times; His praise shall ever be in my mouth. . . . Taste and see that the Lord is sweet." Possibly this communion-psalm had its origin in what the Evangelists St. Matthew and St. Mark relate of our Blessed Lord: "And when they had sung a hymn they went out unto Mount Olivet." On this Dr. Mc'Carthy, in his comment on St. Matthew, says:—

"Christ and His disciples joined in the song of praise. Ten psalms begin with the word *Halleluia*; six of which (xcii.-xcvii.) formed the great song of praise (*Hallel*). Two of these, xcii. (*Laudate Pueri*) and xciii. (*In Exitu Israel*), were usually chanted before, and the remaining four immediately after, the Paschal Supper. We have no evidence that these psalms formed the *Hymn* on the present occasion; but it is likely that our Lord and His disciples conformed to the old and sacred usage."

¹ Mr. A. de Vere.

The remains of the communion-psalm of the early ages are found in the anthem which the priest reads after the reception or distribution of the Blessed Sacrament, and which, taken generally from the Psalms or the Gospels, is called the *Communion* in the missal. It varies daily; but, as need hardly be said, it is always appropriate to the spirit of the feast. It most probably assumed its shape, like the Introit and Gradual and the Offertory, when private masses took the place of the solemn choral masses.

The Post-Communion is of the same date as the collects and secrets. Neither the Communion nor the Post-Communion is found in the Good Friday service.

The *Benedictio* seems to be a most natural conclusion, and consequently is looked upon as dating from a very early period.

The Gospel of St. John was used very generally in mediæval times; but it was only after the Council of Trent that it was placed as at present.

The *De Profundis* is a peculiar and special prayer with the Irish Church. A learned writer in a recent number of the I. E. RECORD thus speaks of the introduction of the Psalm:—

“About the origin of the custom (of reciting the *De Profundis* immediately after the last Gospel) there is much disagreement among archæologists, but all are agreed as to its antiquity. Some say it was introduced as some compensation for the innumerable “foundation masses” for deceased persons, the celebration of which was rendered impossible by the plunderings and persecutions of the so-called Reformers. Others, again, say that this custom dates from the time of Cromwell, and was intended to supply the place of the burial service, of which so many of the pious Oliver’s victims were deprived. The defenders of each opinion say that a rescript from Rome, approving of the practice, was early obtained, and one writer whom we have seen quoted, declared that he had seen a copy of this rescript.” (I. E. RECORD, November, 1890, page 1044.)

The suggestion will be pardoned, that it were well if those who have an opportunity of consulting the archives in Rome, or in whatever quarters could throw light on the matter, would examine into it. It interests the Irish

Church closely, since it is peculiar to it, and also those national Churches into which, from the missionary intercourse of Irish priests, it may have got introduced. Naturally, as the writer says, one comes to the conclusion, from the universality of the custom, that it must have been ordered, or at least sanctioned, by ecclesiastical authority. Father O'Loan gives the alternative suppositions suggested for its introduction; perhaps he would be induced to continue his researches on the matter; it would be conferring a national benefit. One can hardly doubt but some notice or allusion must exist concerning it; especially as its introduction was, relatively, so recent as the Penal times. When the reverend professor says that "all are agreed as to its *antiquity*," he does not mean *antiquity* in the same sense that this article has been using the word, *i.e.*, equivalent to early Christian days, but that the custom is not of the present century or the last.

To sum up then: there are four great rites or liturgies:—

1. *The Syrian* (Eastern and Western): the present *Armenian* rite is descended from the Western,¹ and the sect of the Nestorians are the only persons now using the East Syrian liturgy.

2. *The Alexandrian* rite: this remained after the Council of Chalcedon as the special property of the monophysites. The Evangelist, St. Mark, was the author of this liturgy, which was used by the African Church and the Fathers of the Desert long before it became the exclusive property of the Monophysites.

3. *The Hispano-Gallic*, or *Mozarabic*: the origin of this is a *crux* to archæologists. As its name implies, it was used in Spain and in Gaul, though generally supposed to be of eastern birth. It is used now only in one place, in Toledo in Spain; and was allowed in the time of Pope Pius V. to be continued as a distinct rite through the influence and energy of the famous Franciscan, Cardinal Ximenes.

4. *The Roman*, the universal liturgy of all the Western

¹ The liturgy of St. Chrysostom derived from this is the usual mass of the Greek Church.

Church. Even among those who follow the Roman rite, there are some differences ; as, for instance, in the Dominican mass. It is said, that the present missal and the present breviary, at the time of the reformation of both, were largely founded on the missal and breviary that were then used among the children of St. Francis.

On collating these different rites, it is found that the further back one proceeds, the closer the manuscript liturgies describing these rites incline. From this it is deduced, that they must originally have sprung from a common source ; and that source can be no other than the Apostles. It is believed, that for some time after the foundation of Christianity, the liturgy of the Church was simply by word of mouth. In that case, it is fair to conclude, that the ceremonial could not have been long. The gravest reason offered for this discipline is the desire to observe the secret of the Holy Sacrifice inviolable, and the danger of books falling into the hands of the uninitiated.

“ We may then safely assume,” says Dr. Gasquet, “ that the main substance of the liturgy was delivered *orally* by the Apostles to their disciples ; though . . . it is clear that definite liturgical formulæ existed in the second century.”—(*Dub. Rev.*, April, 1890.)

Thus, then, the sacred liturgy of holy mass descended from our divine Lord to His Apostles ; from the Apostles orally to their immediate followers. Being orally handed down, it necessarily varied somewhat in detail ; the East following St. James ; Africa following St. Mark ; Rome the head of the Apostles ; and Lyons and Marseilles receiving from Asia Minor (as is suggested) the foundation of the Hispano-Gallic Rite.

As has been said, the Good Friday service will be a good guide (indeed the best we have) to the rites of the early Church. What the ceremonial reached at the time of St. Gregory is summed up in one or two sentences by Dr. Gasquet, in his scholarly and highly interesting papers in the *Dublin Review* :—

“ A psalm, or part of one [he says], was sung by the choir on the entrance of the celebrant, who then said the collect. The

Epistle followed, separated from the Gospel by a psalm, represented by our Gradual or Tract ; and after the Gospel came the sermon, and the withdrawal of those who had no right to assist at the Holy Sacrifice. The choir sung a psalm, while the faithful brought their offering, the celebrant making the oblation in silence, and ending with the secret. Then, came the Preface and Canon, as at present, followed by the Lord's Prayer, the fraction, and the kiss of peace. The celebrant and faithful then received Communion, a psalm being sung meanwhile ; and the mass was concluded by a variable Post-Communion and a Benedictio super populum." (April, 1890.)

R. O'KENNEDY.

WHAT DO THE IRISH SING ?

"**T**RASH, mostly, and treason," will be many an Englishman's, and, for the matter of that, many an Irishman's, reply. Not so, perhaps, if he has had the fortune of reading, in *The Nineteenth Century*, of some years ago, Sir J. Pope Hennessy's answer to the question, "What do the Irish Read?" This distinguished Irishman has, in his article, printed, perhaps, a little treason ; but no trash, as all must confess, save those who are judges neither of trash nor treason. I hope many Englishmen, and many of my own countrymen who have shared with me the disadvantages of an education in England, have read that admirable article, and have laid to heart its lesson—a very serious one. I may be pardoned, since it is very much to my purpose, if I give the following extract. "A Munster parish priest is speaking :—

"If you go by the test of literary taste and knowledge, those working-men of the country reading-rooms, and those shopboys and clerks of the city, are no longer the lower classes. The young gentlemen educated at Oscott or Stonyhurst—sons of pious fathers and mothers—young gentlemen who may be seen in the smoking-room of the Munster Club, or at the races, or emulating the style of some of the military mashers—these are not now-a-days, from a literary point of view, our upper or middle-class youth."

Then follows a long list of the books now most popular in the reading-rooms, comprising the works—mostly historical and biographical—of MacGeoghegan, M'Gee, Duffy, Macaulay,

Justin M'Carthy, Lecky, Mitchel, Sullivan, Maguire, and so forth. A contrast, this, to the "mashers'" list, where Ouida, Zola, and, *rubesco referens*, George Moore, bear away their unblushing honours. But it is not of Irish reading that I wish to treat in this article, but of Irish singing. We have been always allowed the credit of being musical. If it were asked on what grounds this credit rested, the answer would probably be—"Oh, the Irish melodies—Moore's melodies; they are enough for any nation to be proud of. Of course, the Irish are musical." Well, we do not disclaim Moore's melodies. They are—both the words of the modern poet, and the ancient airs which those words have at once enfeebled and immortalized—a collection of national lyrics which we challenge the world to equal. But they are not the songs of which Irishmen are proudest or fondest. They are not the songs that are oftenest sung by the people. A few of them are truly and deservedly popular; but by far the greater number of them are already forgotten as songs, and survive only as lyrics. The truth is, they were never racy of Irish soil. Some of them, indeed, will make the Irish heart beat fast to the end of time; but most of them live only as sweet ballads—matchless in fancy and felicitous expression, but wanting, as their author was, in that honest fire and truth and courage that alone can lastingly move a nation's heart. Irish *litterateurs* will ever praise them; but Irish voices will choose, and have already chosen, the songs of better, if not more gifted, men. Moore himself, in lines themselves most touching, and wedded to an air perhaps the sweetest of all the Irish melodies, has told us the secret of his charm and of his failure. "Dear Harp of my Country" is his tender good-bye to the work of fitting words to Irish music. Apostrophizing his "own Island Harp," he sings:—

"The warm lay of love, and the light note of gladness
Have wakened thy fondest, thy liveliest thrill;
But so oft hast thou echoed the deep sigh of sadness,
That even in thy mirth it will steal from thee still."

That sadness of Moore's was the sadness of despair. In the inner life of Ireland "the sweetest lyrist of her saddest

wrong" took little interest. True, he had written—in his "mirth," we may suppose—those prophetic words, so often fondly repeated in Ireland :—

"The nations have fallen, and thou still art young ;
Thy sun is but rising, when others are set :
And though slavery's cloud o'er thy morning hath hung,
The full noon of freedom shall beam round thee yet.
Erin, O Erin ! though long in the shade,
Thy star will shine out when the proudest shall fade."

But the first glimmerings of that light appalled the snugly-nested singer, and, instead of greeting it with a pæan, he lamented it in a dirge :—

"Tis gone, and for ever, the light we saw breaking,
Like heaven's first dawn o'er the sleep of the dead—
When man, from the slumber of ages awaking,
Looked upward, and blessed the pure ray ere it fled.
'Tis gone, and the gleams it has left of its burning
But deepen the long night of sorrow and mourning
That dark o'er the kingdoms of earth is returning,
And darkest of all, hapless Erin, o'er thee."

Such unhealthy hopelessness, even thus exquisitely sung, could not stand against the young, fresh voices that were then proclaiming Ireland's second spring. Sad for the past—those voices would not have been Irish if that minor strain had not been in them—they were ever full of courage and glad anticipation for their country's future. From end to end of Ireland, to this day, are heard the songs which, more than speech or manifesto, roused the people to that self-reliance and trust in the final prevalence of justice, which brought the nation safe through the darkest hour of her history.

Tom Davis's lines were, indeed, the voice of the nation. Never was there a tenderer muse than his ; but never, when he wrote of Ireland's future, was there a bolder :—

"Let the feeble-hearted pine,
Let the sickly spirit whine,
But to work and win be thine,
While you've life.
God smiles upon the bold ;
So, when your flag's unrolled,
Bear it bravely till you're cold
In the strife."

Lines like the following were not without their effect :—

“ Let the coward shrink aside,
 We'll have our own again ;
 Let the brawling knave deride,
 Here's for our own again !
 Let the tyrant bribe and lie,
 March, threaten, fortify,
 Loose his lawyer and his spy,
 Yet we'll have our own again.”

I do not know a more popular or a more pathetic ballad than Davis's “ Annie Dear ”—a mournful love song up to the very last verse, when the rebel lover passionately weeps his double bereavement—of wife and country :—

“ Far better by thee lying,
 Their bayonets defying,
 Than live an exile, sighing
 Annie, dear ! ”

But there are other songs as popular as any by Davis, which were written in the days when the cause of Irish nationality was supported by the most gifted and pure-souled of Irish thinkers, and which are sung now by those who still stand by that cause. “ Sliabh Cuilinn ” was the signatory to some of the most stirring of all the '48 songs, as they are called. He died recently, after having held the exalted position of Judge; but we may safely say that his countrymen will remember “ Sliabh Cuilinn ” when the honest Judge and refined man of letters is forgotten. The song, “ Ourselves Alone,” sounds much more like that of a Land Leaguer than of a Judge of the Land Court :—

“ Remember, when our lot was worse—
 Sunk, trampled to the dust ;
 'Twas long our weakness and our curse,
 In stranger aid to trust.
 And if, at length, we proudly trod
 On bigot laws o'erthrown,
 Who won the struggle ? Under God,
 Ourselves—OURSELVES ALONE.”

In the troubled days of Fenianism, a poor peasant was brought before a County Court Judge in the North of

Ireland, to answer to the charge of singing a seditious song. The song was read in court. Its strongest verse ran thus :—

“ My boyish ear still clung to hear
Of Érin’s pride of yore,
Ere Norman foot had dared pollute
Her independent shore :
Of chiefs, long dead, who rose to head
Some gallant patriot few,
Till all my aim on earth became
To strike one blow for you,
Dear Land—
To strike one blow for you.”

It was Sliabh Cuilinn’s song of Young Ireland days that the prisoner had sung. But why does the Judge’s kindly voice falter in passing sentence? Can *he* be the writer? Ah, my Lord,

“ *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis!* ”

I have heard that, though the sedition was held proved, the poor singer went free; for the Judge, men say, was himself scarcely penitent, and his heart remained what it always was.

No rebel song ever had such a success in Ireland as Ingram’s famous ballad “ Who Fears to Speak of Ninety-Eight? ” The writer holds now an honoured position in Trinity College, Dublin, an institution which, in spite of extraordinarily adverse influences, has ever been the nursery of sturdy and intelligent national spirits. There is scarcely a social board in Ireland at which that voice from “ Old Trinity ” has not been heard; and only those who know the power of such a song in Ireland can understand the strength of this single link between the Protestant University and the hearts of the Catholic people. There is a hope—shall I call it a belief?—cherished silently in Ireland, that a day of resurrection is not far off, when the promise of such songs will be realized, and when it will appear that the Irish hearts that beat in hostile camps were never really far apart, never entirely false to the noble stirrings of former, happier days.

Fully half the songs that the Irish sing at present were written in the days of the Young Ireland party. The larger movement of more recent times has not been without its lyric

muse. True, there was something too coldly practical about the land agitation to give much inspiration to the poet. The one great song that became, in those days, the national song of the people was not of the League. "God Save Ireland"—T. D. Sullivan's lyric of what the great mass of his countrymen think the "saddest wrong" of the sad Fenian days—was the simple tale of the execution of Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien, in Manchester, on November 23rd, 1867. The air was an American one, and had become popular in London. I remember well the amused contempt with which the singing of this song was met by an English friend, who at once chorused it with the latest music-hall refrain. But there is a proud ring in the air, which fits perfectly the indignation and defiance of the Irish poet's words, and which made those words historical. It is not hard to understand the power of such a verse as this :—

"Climbed they up the rugged stair,
 Rung their voices out in prayer ;
 Then, with England's fatal cord around them cast,
 Close beneath the gallows tree,
 Kissed like brothers lovingly,
 True to Home and Faith and Freedom to the last.
 ' God save Ireland,' prayed they loudly ;
 ' God save Ireland,' said they all :
 ' Whether on the scaffold high
 Or the battlefield we die,
 Oh, what matter, when for Erin dear we fall ! ' "

There is another song, still often heard in the south, that T. D. Sullivan wrote in the same troubled year. A grim humour is in it that was relished at that time. The subject was the remarkable influx just then of Americans, and the name of the song (no one could claim elegance for it) was "Square-toed Boots." The Government had threatened to arrest the suspicious-looking strangers :—

"But now the news has travelled afar across the sea,
 Old Uncle Sam has heard it, and a mighty man is he ;
 Through all his huge anatomy a thrill of anger shoots,
 And like thunder comes the stamping of his square-toed boots.
 And Johnny Bull grows fearful, as surely well he may,
 When up that giant rises, and strides across his way ;
 For past experience whispers, what no later fact refutes,
 That there's terrible propulsion in his square-toed boots."

Such lines are, perhaps, not pleasant reading ; the humour is too saturnine, and is not a fair specimen of the writer's usual kindly vein. I remember that at the last festive gathering at which I heard that song, it was followed by one that has always been a favourite, written by the same author—"R. C. C.," the initials of "Roman Catholic Curate." This is a verse:—

"His heart is near the people's hearts,
He knows their wrongs, he feels their smarts,
He sees the tyrant's cruel arts,
And through his veins each outrage darts.
Oh ! firm and true as steel is he,
The calm, courageous R. C. C. !
The friend of truth and liberty,
The youthful patriot R. C. C. !"

"T. D.," as he is called through the country, was the poet of the League. To the splendid march of the Southern army he set the now well-known words:—

"Hurrah ! hurrah ! for home and liberty !
Hurrah ! hurrah ! the truth shall make us free !
Raise it on your banners, boys, for all the world to see —
God made the land for the people !"

Many of these songs, which, from the pages of *The Nation*, were copied week by week into scores of papers in Ireland, America, and Australia, and sung wherever his countrymen are to be found, were written in the House of Commons. Mr. Sullivan, elected to make his country's laws, and doing his part therein devotedly, prefers the more important as well as more congenial task of making her ballads. That busy pen would be watched with greater interest if men in Westminster knew that it writes the songs of a people whose nature it is to sing when they are most in earnest, and to place, as in days of old, the national poet before even the national soldier.

The ballad-singer has always been a favourite in Ireland. No fair or market, no race meeting or political meeting is complete without him. He often composes the song he sings, and if it takes the fancy of his hearers he rapidly disposes of the slip copies. No event of any interest passes

without its ballad; no hero remains unsung. I have before me a rudely-printed sheet which I bought in the street of Thurles one spring evening. It is a fair specimen of the class. A coffin appears at the top of the slip, and the lines open thus :—

“ Once more this week does Carey wreak his vengeance on mankind,
 And once again we see with pain the black flag in the wind ;
 Another dupe compelled to stoop to deeds of sin and shame !
 ‘ God help my wife and family, Dan Curley is my name,
 On the gallows high I’m forced to die and leave my happy home,
 But hope to meet with mercy sweet from God in kingdom come,
 Out from my heart ere I depart there’s one advice I’m giving,
 To shun unlawful meetings, and to trust in no man living.’ ”

The ballad ends with an appeal for the prayers of the hearers

“ ‘ To the Lord above, that, thro’ the love He bears for all mankind,
 He’ll pardon me on the gallows tree, and that I’ll mercy find.’ ”

All are not so mild as that. Though often coarse in expression, Irish street ballads are, thank God, singularly pure, and the priest generally comes to hear at once of any impropriety, and stops the danger on the spot. Treason is, of course, plentifully sung—if that can be called treason which is simply the untutored expression of passionate loyalty to the old country, and wholesale defiance of her foes. I remember the magistrates of a town in the county of Tipperary being called on to pass judgment on two boys for singing a rebel song, from which I cull the following :—

“ Then brighten up your rifles, boys,
 And see your blades are keen,
 And rally in your thousands
 ‘ Neath our own immortal green.
 Like soldiers of true freedom
 We’ll fight for liberty ;
 And with flashing blades and rifles, boys,
 We’ll make old Ireland free ! ”

The indictment described the ballad as “ calculated to excite Her Majesty’s subjects, and bring the Government of Ireland

into contempt ! ” The boys were rightly scolded for singing this “ obnoxious production,” which, though sung in South Tipperary, came, they said, from Belfast.

But these quotations and remarks must end. If the subject required an apology I could find one in the fact that one good song in Ireland has even now more power over the people than a dozen speeches, and even than many sermons; and if it is objected that this article, as a whole, is not comfortable reading for some of the subscribers to the I. E. RECORD, I answer that I have tried to put before them, not my views, but some important facts indicative of the sentiments of a people with whom sentiment is paramount. It may comfort some to know—what the songs that the Irish sing sufficiently prove—that the prevailing sentiment in Ireland now is one of self-reliance and hope.

ARTHUR RYAN.

THE BLESSED EDMUND CAMPION'S “HISTORY OF IRELAND” AND ITS CRITICS.—II.

A REVIEWER of my former paper¹ admits that I have shown “that Campion had an eye for what was good in the Irish.” Consequently I have proved that Keating's statements, *supra*, page 632, are without foundation. I add more evidence of Campion's kindly feelings.

III. THE IRISH PEOPLE.

“An old distinction there is of Ireland into Irish and English pales; for when the Irish had raised continual tumults against the English, planted here with the conquest, at last they coursed them into a narrow circuit of certain shires in Leinster, which the English did choose as the fattest soil, most defensible, their proper right, and most open to receive help from England. Hereupon it was termed their Pale, out of which they durst not peep.

“The language is sharp and sententious, offereth great

¹ In *The National Press*, July 9th.

occasion to quick apophthegms and proper allusions ; wherefore their common jesters, bards, and rhymers are said to delight passingly those that conceive the grace and propriety of the tongue. But the true Irish, indeed, differeth so much from that they commonly speak, that scarce one among five score can either write, read, or understand it. Therefore it is prescribed among certain their poets and other students of antiquity.

“The people are thus inclined: religious, frank, morous, ireful, sufferable of pains infinite, very glorious, excellent horsemen, delighted with wars, great alms-givers, passing in hospitality, where they fancy and favour a wonderful kind. . . . Being virtuously bred up or reformed, they are such mirrors of holiness, and austerity, that other nations retain a show or shadow of devotion in comparison of them. As for abstinence and fasting, which these days make so dangerous, this is to them a familiar kind of chastisement, in which virtue, and divers others how far the best excel, so far in gluttony and other hateful crimes, the vicious they are worse than too bad. Greedy of praise they be, and fearful of dishonour ; and to this end they esteem their poets, who write Irish learnedly, and pen their sonnets heroical, for which they are bountifully rewarded. But if they send out libels in dispraise thereof, the gentlemen, especially the mere Irish, stand in great awe. They love tenderly their foster children, and bequeathe to them a child's portion ; whereby they nourish sure friendship, so beneficial in every way,¹ that commonly five hundred kine and better are given in reward to win a nobleman's child to foster. They love and trust their foster-brethren more than their own. They are sharp-witted, lovers of learning, capable of any study whereunto they bend themselves,² constant in travail, adventurous, intractable, kind-hearted, secret in displeasure. Hitherto the Irish of both sorts (mere and English) are affected much indifferently, save that in these, by good order and breaking, the virtues are far more frequent. In these others there is daily trial of good natures among them, how soon they be reclaimed, and to what rare gifts of grace and wisdom they do and have aspired.

“Clear men they are of skin and hue . . . Their women are well-favoured, clear-coloured, fair-handed, big and large, suffered from their infancy to grow at will, nothing curious of their feature and proportion of body. Their infants of the meaner sort are neither swaddled nor lapped in linen, but folded up naked into a blanket till they can go. Linen shirts the rich do wear for wantonness and bravery, with wide hanging sleeves plaited ; thirty yards are little enough for one of them. Proud they are of long-crisped glybbes, and do nourish the same with

¹ Spencer denounces this, and urges its suppression.

² But were forbidden by law to learn.

all their cunning; to crop the front thereof they take it for a notable piece of villainy. Where they fancy and favour, they are wonderful kind; they exchange by commutation of wares for the most part, and have utterly no coin stirring in any great lords' houses. Some of them be richly plaited; their ladies are trimmed rather with massive jewels than with garish apparel; it is counted a beauty in them to be tall, round, and fat.

"They honour devout friars and pilgrims, suffer them to pass quietly, spare them and their mansions, whatsoever outrage they show to the country besides them; for the Irish are in no way outrageous against holy men. 'I remember,' Cambrensis writeth himself, 'merrily to have objected to Morris, then archbishop of Cashel, that Ireland in so many hundred years hath not brought forth one martyr. The bishop answered pleasantly; but, alluding to the murder of Thomas of Canterbury, 'our people,' quoth he, 'notwithstanding their other enormities, yet have evermore spared the blood of saints; marry now, as we are to be delivered to such a nation that is well acquainted with making martyrs; henceforward, I trust, this complaint will cease.'

"As to the Irish saints, though my search thereof, in this my haste out of the land, be very cumbersome, yet being loath to neglect the memory of God's friends, more glorious to a realm than all the victories and triumphs of the world, I think it good to furnish out this chapter with some extracts touching the saints of Ireland—namely, those that are most notable, mentioned by authors of good credit. . . .

"Without either precepts or observation of congruity the Irish speak Latin like a vulgar language, learned in their common schools of leachcraft and law, whereat they begin children, and hold on sixteen or twenty years, conning by rote the aphorisms of Hypocrates and the civil institutions, and a few other parings of these two faculties. I have seen them, where they kept school, ten in some one chamber, groveling upon couches of straw, their books at their noses, themselves lying flat prostrate, and so to chant out their lessons by peacemeal, being the most part lusty fellows of twenty-five years and upwards. . . .

"Other lawyers they have, liable to certain families, who, after the custom of the country, determine and judge causes. These consider of wrongs offered and received among their neighbours, be it murder, or felony, or trespass; all is redeemed by composition (except the grudge of parties seek revenge); and the time they have to spare from spoiling and proying they lightly bestow in parleying about such matters. The Breighoon (so they call this kind of lawyer) sitteth him down on a bank, the lords and gentlemen at variance round about him, and then they proceed. To rob and prey their enemies they deem it no offence, nor seek any means to recover their loss, but even to

watch them the like turn ; but if neighbours and friends send their cators to purloin one another, such actions are judged by the Breighoon aforesaid. . . .

"Shamrocks, water-cresses, roots and other herbs they feed upon ; oatmeal and butter they cram together. They drink whey, milk, and beef-broth ; flesh they devour without bread ; corn, such as they have, they keep for their horses. In haste and hunger, they squeeze out the blood of raw flesh, and ask no more dressing thereto ; the rest boileth in their stomachs with aquavitæ, which they swill in, after such a surfeit, by quarts and pottles. Their kine they let blood, which, grown to a jelly, they bake and overspread with butter, and so eat it in lumps."

IV.—PORTRAITS OF INDIVIDUAL IRISHMEN.

Omitting his beautiful sketches of Irish saints, I give those of ordinary Christians, some of whom were not paragons of piety. His appreciation of Irish piety is revealed in the record of the foundation of "St. Mary's Abbey, beside Dublin," of the Abbeys of Roseglasse, Dunbrody, Jerpoint, "Ines in Ulster," Ingo Dei, Comer, Kilmaynam, and Kilcullen ; of the Abbey of Knockinoy, by Cathal Crowderg, king of Connaught ; of the Abbey of Mellifont, founded by the good king of Ergall, "which is the oldest I find recorded since the Danes' arrival, except St. Mary's Abbey, beside Dublin."¹ He says that—

"When the City of Dublin was wasted by fire, and the bell-house of Christ Church was utterly defaced, the citizens, before they repaired their private harms, jointly came to succour ; and collections were made to redress the ruins of that ancient building, which work, at the decay of fire and since, many devout citizens of Dublin have beautified."¹

He tells that—

"In 1835 died Kimvricke Shereman, sometimes Mayor of Dublin, a benefactor of every church and religious house twenty miles round about the city.¹ His legacies to the poor and others, besides the liberality showed in his lifetime, amounted to 3,000 marks ; with such plenty were our fathers blessed, that cheerfully gave of their true winnings to needful purposes ; whereas our time, that gaineth excessively, and whineth at every farthing to be spent on the poor, is yet oppressed with scarcity and beggary, . . . This Mayoralty of Dublin both for state and charge of

¹ Keating asserts that "he does not speak or think of such things" !

office and for bountiful hospitality exceedeth any city in England except London . . . James Butler, grandsire of James the Lord Deputy, in 1421, was surnamed 'the chaste,' for that of all vices he most abhorred the sin of the flesh, and in subduing of the same gave notable example."

I pass over such touches as—

"This report of an insult offered to the Irish Franklins by two Normans, pickthanks of the guard of John, Earl of Gloucester, caused the mightiest Irish captains to stick together, while their lives lasted, and for no manner of earthly thing to slack the defence of their ancient liberty."

And again:—

"The Irish of Leinster made insurrections, so did Mageoghegan in Meath, and O'Brien in Munster, in which stir, William Bermingham, a warrior incomparable, was found halting, and was condemned to die by Roger Outlawe. then Lieutenant to the Lord Justice, and so hanged was he, a knight among thousands odd and singular."

Of Shane O'Neill, the great enemy of the English, he says:—

"Of all the Irish princes none was comparable to O'Neill for antiquity and nobleness of blood . . . O'Neill encroached upon the full possession of Ulster, abiding uncontrolled, till Con O'Neill, fearing the puissance of Henry VIII., exhibited to him a voluntary submission, surrendered all titles of honour, received at his hands the earldom of Tirowen, to be held of the king, of English form and tenure; arms he gave the bloody hand a terrible significance. His son, Shane, after his father's decease, was reputed for the rightful O'Neill, took it, kept it, challenged superiority over the Irish lords of Ulster, warred also upon the English part; subdued O'Reilly, imprisoned O'Donnell, his wife, and his sons, enriched himself with O'Donnell's forts, castles, and plate, detained pledges of obedience, the wife and child, fortified a strong island in Tyrone, which he named spitefully *Foogh-na-Gall*; that is, 'the hate of Englishmen,' whom he so detested, that he hanged a soldier for eating English biscuit . . . He was yet persuaded by Melchior Hussey,¹ sent unto him from the Earl of Kildare, to reconcile himself to good order . . . and he made a voyage into England, where the courtiers, noting his haughtiness and barbarity, devised his style thus:—'O'Neill the Great, cousin to St. Patrick, friend to the Queen of England,

¹ It was as an Irish servant of this Melchior that our author escaped to England.

enemy to all the world besides.' Thence he sped home again, graciously dealt with; used civility, expelled the Scots out of all Ulster, where they intended a conquest; wounded and took prisoner their captain, James MacConil, their chieftain; ordered the North so properly, that, if any subject could prove the loss of money or goods within his precinct, he would assuredly either force the robber to restitution, or, of his own cost, redeem the harm, to the loser's contentation. Sitting at meat, before he put one morsel into his mouth, he used to slice a portion above the daily alms, and send it, namely, to some beggar at his gate, saying, 'it was meet to serve Christ first.'

"Gerald FitzGerald, Earl of Kildare, a mighty-made man, full of honour and courage, had been Lord Deputy and Lord Justice of Ireland thirty-four years. Between him and the Earl of Ormond their own jealousies were fed with envy and ambition, and kindled with certain lewd factions, abettors of either side, ever since Ormond, with a great army of Irishmen, camping in St. Thomas Court at Dublin, seemed to face the countenance and power of the Deputy. These occasions, I say, fostered a malice betwixt them and their posterities, many years after incurable, causes of much ruffle and unquietness in the realm, until the confusion of one house and the nonage of the other discontinued their quarrels, which, except their inheritors have the grace to put up, and love unfeignedly, as Gerald and Thomas do now, may hap to turn their countries to little good, and themselves to less.

"Ormond was nothing inferior to the other in stomach, and in reach of policy was far beyond him . . . Kildare was in government a mild man, to his enemies intractable; to the Irish such a scourge, that, rather for despite of him than for favour of any part, they relied upon the Butlers, came in under his protection, served at his call, performed by starts, as their manner is, the duty of good subjects. Ormond was secret and drift, of much moderation in speech, dangerous of every little wrinkle that touched his reputation. Kildare was open and passionable, in his mood desperate, both of word and deed . . . a warrior incomparable; towards the nobles, that he favoured not, somewhat headlong and unruly. Being charged before Henry VII. for burning the Church of Cashel, and many witnesses being prepared to avouch against him the truth of that article, he suddenly confessed the fact, to the great wondering and detestation of the council. When it was looked how he would justify the matter:—'By — quoth he, 'I would never have done it had it not been told me that the archbishop was within.' And because the archbishop was one of his busiest accusers there present, merrily laughed the king at the plainness of the man, to see him allege that intent for excuse which most of all did aggravate his fault.

"Gerald Fitzgerald was son of the aforesaid earl, and Lord Deputy. He chased the nation of the O'Tooles, battered

O'Carroll's castles in 1516, and awed all the Irish of the land more and more. A gentleman valiant and well-spoken, yet in his latter time overtaken with vehement suspicion of sundry treasons . . . The Earl of Ossory brought evident proofs of the deputy's disorder: that he winked at the Earl of Desmond, whom he should have attached by the king's letters; that he curried acquaintance and friendship with the mere Irish enemies; that he armed them against him (Ossory), the king's deputy; that he hanged and hewed roughly good subjects, whom he suspected to lean to the Butler's friendship. Yet again, therefore, was Kildare commanded to appear before the council. The Earl of Ossory, to show his ability of service, brought to Dublin an army of Irishmen, having captains over them, O'Connor, O'More, and O'Carroll, and at St. Mary's Abbey was chosen deputy. In which office (being himself, save only in feats of arms, a simple gentleman) he bare out his honour and the charge of government very worthily, through the singular wisdom of his countess (a sister of Kildare's), a lady of such port, that all the estates of the realm crouched unto her, so politic, that nothing was thought substantially debated without her advice, manlike and tall of stature, very rich and bountiful. But to those virtues was yoked such a self-liking, and such a majesty above the tenure of a subject, that, for insurance thereof, she sticked not to abuse her husband's honour against her brother's folly. Notwithstanding, I learn not that she practised his undoing; but that she by indirect means wrought her brother out of credit to advance her husband, the common voice and the thing itself speaketh."

V.—THE SPEECHES OF IRISHMEN REPORTED IN THE
"HISTORY."

These speeches are good specimens of Campion's much-admired style; and as they reveal something of what he thought of Irishmen and the state of their country, I shall give a few extracts:—

"The sixteen beautiful Irish striplings drew forth from under their womanlike garments their skeans, and valiantly bestirred themselves, stabbing first the tyrant Turgesius, next the youth present, that prepared but small resistance. Out flew the fame thereof into all quarters of Ireland, and the princes, nothing dull to catch hold of such advantage, with one assent rose ready to pursue their liberty. All Meath and Leinster were soon gathered to O'Melaghlin, the father of this practice, who lightly leaped to horse, and commanding their forwardness in so natural a quarrel, said:—

" ' Lordlings and friends, this case neither admitteth delay

nor asketh policy: heart and haste is all in all. While the feat is young and strong, and that of our enemies some sleep, some sorrow, some curse, some consult, all are dismayed, let us anticipate their fury, dismember their force, cut off their flight, occupy their places of refuge and succour. It is no mastery to pluck their feathers, but their necks, nor to chase them in, but to rouse them out; to weed them, not to rake them; not to tread them down, but to dig them up. This lesson the tyrant himself hath taught me. I once demanded of him in a parable by what good husbandry the land might be rid of certain crows that annoyed it; he advised me to watch where they bred, and to fire their nests about their ears. Go we then upon these cormorants that shroud themselves in our possessions, and let us destroy them, so that neither nest nor root, nor seed, nor stalk, nor stub, may remain of this ungracious generation.'

"Scarce had he spoken the word, but, with great shouts and clamours, they extolled the king as patron of their lives and families, assured both courage and expedition, joined their confederates, and with a running camp swept every corner of the land, razed the castles to the ground, and chased the strangers before them; slew all that abode the battle, and recovered, each man, his own precinct and former state of government. . . .

"Whilst the Cardinal (Wolsey) was speaking, the Earl of Kildare chafed and changed colour, and sundry proffers made to answer every sentence as it came. At last he broke out, and interrupted him thus:—

"My Lord Chancellor, I beseech you, pardon me. I am short-witted, and you, I perceive, intend a long tale. . . . But go to, suppose my cousin Desmond be never had, what is Kildare to blame for it more than my good brother of Ossory, who, notwithstanding his high promises, having also the king's power, is glad to take eggs for his money, and bring him in at leisure. Cannot the Earl of Desmond shift, but I must be of counsel? Cannot he be hid, except I wink? If he be close, am I his mate? If he be friended, am I a traitor? . . . I know (the informers) too well to reckon myself convict by their bare words, or heedless hearsays, or frantic oaths. Of my cousin Desmond they may lie lewdly, since no man here can tell the contrary. Touching myself, I never noted in them so much wit, or so much faith, that I could have gaged upon their silence the life of a good hound, much less mine own. . . . But of another thing it grieveth me that your good Grace, whom I take to be wise and sharp, and who of your own blessed disposition wish me well, should be so far gone in crediting those corrupt informers, that abuse the ignorance of their state and country to my peril. Little know you, my Lord, how necessary it is not only for the governor, but also for every nobleman in Ireland, to hamper his vincible neighbours at discretion; wherein, if they waited for process of law, and had

not these lives and lands, you speak of, within their reach, they might hap to lose their own lives and lands without law. You hear of a case as it were in a dream, and feel not the smart that vexeth us. In England there is not a mean subject that dare extend his hand to filip a peer of the realm. In Ireland, except the Lord hath cunning to his strength, and strength to save his own, and sufficient authority to rack thieves and varlets when they stir, he shall find them swarm so fast, that it will be too late to call for justice. As touching my kingdom, my Lord, I wish you and I had exchanged kingdoms but for one month! I would trust to gather up more crumbs in that space, than twice the revenues of my poor earldom. But you are well and warm, and so hold you, and upbraid me not with such an odious storm. I sleep in a cabin, when you lie soft in your bed of down; I serve under the cope of heaven, when you are served under a canopy; I drink water out of a skull, when you drink out of golden cups; my courser is trained to the field, when your jennet is taught to amble; when you are begraced, and belorded, and crouched and knelt unto, then I find small grace with our Irish borderers, except I cut them off by the knees.'

"Kildare's son, Lord Thomas, being deputy in his place, on hearing the false report of his father's execution, stood before the Council in Dublin, and spoke:—

"'Howsoever injuriously we be handled, and forced to defend ourselves in arms, when neither our service nor our good meaning towards our prince's crown availeth, yet say not hereafter but in this open hostility, which we profess here and proclaim, we have shown ourselves no villaines nor churls, but warriors and gentlemen. This sword of state is yours, not mine; I received it with an oath, and have used it to your benefit; I should offend mine honour, if I turned it to your annoyance. Now I have need of mine own sword, which I dare trust. As for this common sword, it flattereth me with a golden scabbard, but hath in it a pestilent edge, already bathed in the Geraldines' blood, and whetteth itself in hope of destruction. Save yourselves from us as from your open enemies! I am none of Henry's deputy, I am his foe, I have more mind to conquer than to govern, to meet him in the field than to serve him in office. If all the hearts in England and Ireland, that have cause thereto, would join in this quarrel (as I trust they will), then should he be a byeword (as I trust he shall), for his heresy, lechery, and tyranny, wherein the age to come may score him among the ancient princes of most abominable and hateful memory.'"

On the 12th of December, 1570, our author was present in the Upper House of Parliament in Dublin, and heard two speeches, whereof he took notes on coming home to his

lodging. He delivered them as near as he "could call them to mind in the same words and sentences," that he heard them. Campion's Catholic host, the Speaker Stanihurst, addressing the Lord Deputy, urged the erection of grammar schools within every diocese, and of a university, and he added :—

"Surely might one generation sip a little of this liquor, and so be induced to long for more; both our countrymen, that live obedient, and our unquiet neighbours, would find such sweetness in the taste thereof, as it would be a ready way to reclaim them. The unbroken borderers possibly might be won by this example."

Sydney, the Lord Deputy, also spoke in favour of the establishment of a university, and then passed to the subject of a standing army :—

"You are wont to reason: Why should not we live without an army as well as they do in England? Why cannot our noblemen of might in every border, our tenants and servants, withstand the Irish next them, as well as the northern lords and inhabitants of Ridesdale and Tiddesdale, and those about the Scottish bank resist the Scots facing and pilfering as fast as our enemies? Touching Scotland, it is well known, they were never the men whom England need to fear. They are but a corner cut out, and easily tamed, when they wax outrageous. Your foes lie in the bosom of your countries, more in number, richer of ground, desperate thieves, ever at an inch, impossible to be severed from you, without any fence besides your own valiantness and the help of our soldiers. England is quiet within itself, thoroughly peopled on that side of Scotland which most requireth it, guarded with an army; otherwise the lords and gentlemen and lusty yeomen that dwelt on a row, are ready to master their private vagaries; the island is from all foreign invasions walled with the wide ocean. Were such a sea betwixt you and the Irish, or were they shut up in an odd end of the land, or had they no such opportunities of bogs and woods as they have, or were they lords of the lesser part of Ireland, or were they severed into handfuls, not able to annoy whole townships and baronies, as they do, the comparison were somewhat like. But alack! it fareth not so with you. You are beset round; your towns are feeble, the land empty, the commons bare, every county by itself cannot save itself. Take away the terror and fear of our band, which increaseth your strength, and many an Irish lord would be set agog, that now is full lowly, and holdeth in his horns; and the open enemy would scour your quarters, that now dares not venture lest he pay for his passage."

From all these passages taken together the reader will see how inexact are the following statements:—"Campion never notices the piety, virtues, valour, and charity of the Irish ;"¹ "he was employed to write down everything Irish ;"² "he wrote with all the prejudices of an Englishman of the sixteenth century ;"³ "his hatred of the Irish was as intense and unnatural as that of Spencer ;"⁴ "Edmund Spencer is the *least unkind* of English critics of Ireland."⁵

The last two statements are partly disproved by the passages quoted already ; I know, and at another time will prove them to be false.

EDMUND HOGAN, S.J.

CHURCHES IN THE EAST.—II.

THE liturgy of the patriarchate of Constantinople, and which in the course of time began to be regarded as the liturgy of the Greek Church, owes its origin to the Apostles, who preached the Gospel there. It is, therefore, called by the Greeks themselves "Apostolic." St. John Chrysostom gave it its present form, and as so modified is in use throughout the entire Greek Church, whether orthodox or in union with Rome. Step by step the patriarchal See of Constantinople succeeded in forcing this liturgy into all those parts of the Eastern Churches which remained faithful after the Monophysite and Nestorian heresies had rent the East. Disunion, however, was not averted. The attacks of paganism had but the effect of knitting the bond uniting East and West ; distrust and ambition succeeded in severing it. From the very outset the patriarchs of Constantinople set themselves at the head of this destructive movement.

¹ Keating's *Hist.*, ed. Haliday, pages ix., lxxiii.

² *Hist. of Ireland*, by D'Arcy M'Ghee, vol. ii., page 74.

³ Dewar's *Observations on Ireland*, ed. 1812, page 49.

⁴ Dr. Kelly, in *Cambrensis Eversus*, ii., 364.

⁵ Sir Henry Maine's *History of Institutions*, page 20.

Ambitious of an equality with Rome, they trampled upon the rights of more ancient and venerable sees in the East than their own. Jealous of Rome, of the Western Church, they did not hesitate to bow their heads before the despotic decrees of imperial minions, who hesitated not to intrude in matters which were of God and not of Cæsar. It was clear to the world that with the close of the sixth century the glory of the Eastern Church was about to fade away for ever. The glorious names that adorned the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, could find no counterparts whatever in the individuals who stood at the head of the Eastern Church in the sixth. The high ideal after which early Christianity had been continually aspiring, was utterly abandoned by the retrograding acts of the Trullan Synod. Perhaps, as Origen had predicted, the work of the Eastern Church was accomplished in the downfall of paganism. It was clear that, bit by bit, the bond uniting the East and West was becoming looser, until, as every student of ecclesiastical history knows too well, it broke at a moment the most un auspicious possible—a moment when Christianity saw itself in danger of being swept away by the torrent of Islamism. As it does not enter the province of the writer to describe the events either preceding the Photian schism, or those which accompanied it, he finds himself bound to pass on, and merely describe the Eastern Church as it arose out of the schism. A few words, however, are necessary ere that be entered upon.

The patriarchate of Constantinople, though the last in point of time as to its erection, became in the course of time, owing to the establishment of the imperial court there, the chief in the entire East. The Church there had had from the apostolic age a liturgy which it derived from the Apostles sent there to preach the Gospel. This liturgy was modified by St. John Chrysostom (354-407), and as so modified is in existence at present. Its peculiar features are: leavened bread and the use of the chalice for the laity.

The work of separation began, as is well known, with Photius (*obit.* 891); but it can hardly be said to have been completely achieved until the middle of the eleventh century,

when Michael Cerularius (1043-59) declared for the complete separation of the Eastern Church from that of the West. Unfortunately, it happened that almost the entire East followed the patriarchate in its apostacy. The efforts which were made at various periods to bring back the Eastern Church to unity are too well known to readers of the I. E. RECORD to be here repeated. The points in dispute were brought to their narrowest limits at the Florentine Council. It was clear, then, to all, that there was only one question of any essential import, *i.e.*, the *divine* supremacy of the Church of Rome. Every other question was either a matter of grammatical expression, such as regards the question whether *Filoque* or *per Filium* be inserted in the Creed, or else was one of mere liturgy and discipline. However, the efforts of the Council proved futile in the end. The germ of disunion lay deeper than the theologians at the Council were inclined to believe; it lay in the jealousies of the entire East towards the West, and there it remains even to the present day.¹

The apostacy of the patriarchate of Constantinople, then, dragged with it that of every Church in the East in union with it. Everywhere, except, as is generally stated, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, the West beheld the bonds uniting Christendom snapping asunder. Constantinople had in the course of ages built up what the world regarded as the Greek Church. Her patriarchs had driven out old and venerable liturgies from the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria; and now, when she had raised the banner of revolt, these two followed her in her rebellion; and when either she or her children will return to the unity of that fold from which they have gone out, seems a matter that Providence alone can bring about. In the East the hierarchy of the Greek Church consists of the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, having

¹ At the present day the orthodox Greeks apparently deny the Procession of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son, as well as Purgatory. At the Council of Florence, when these matters were brought up for discussion, it was clear to Western minds that what the Greeks objected to was the Western mode of expressing these truths, not the truths themselves.

under them numerous bishoprics. A large portion of the Greek Church has, however, in the course of time returned to unity with the Church of Rome. This is the United Greek Church, called in the East Melekites.¹ They may possibly reach a million and a half, or even two millions, in Asia Minor and Syria; but the greater number of United Greeks are at present in the Austrian Empire. Their hierarchy in Asia Minor consists of the patriarch of Alexandria and Jerusalem. He generally resides at Damascus. There are resident archbishops at Tyr, Hauran, and Aleppo; and bishops in Beyrout, Homs, Baalbeck, Saida or Sidon, and a few other places in Asia Minor and Syria. The places where the United Greeks are most numerous in, are Syria and Alexandria, Damascus and Aleppo, there being in the last nearly twenty thousand. Small communities of them are to be found in nearly every town, and in Syria and Palestine are more numerous than their quondam co-religionists of the orthodox Church. As to their liturgy, in Syria and Egypt it is celebrated in Arabic, the only Greek used being the words of the consecration. It differs in nowise from that of the orthodox Church, and both practically use the vernacular language of whatever country they are in. Thus the name Greek does not denote anything else but liturgy; and even that, as far as Greek is concerned, is almost a non-existing item in Syria.

The Latin Church, too, has established herself in the East, amid, so to speak, the wreck and ruin of the Churches that have unfortunately fallen away from unity with her to cower before the pride of Islam. Though it may be impossible at present to state the exact moment when native Latin communities first began to exist in the East, it may be safely admitted that such hardly existed before the eleventh century. Religious communities of Latins, that is, of nuns and monks from Europe, have undoubtedly existed, at least in Palestine, wherever there were sanctuaries, as far back as the fourth century; but it does not appear that

¹ Melekite, *Siriace et Arabice*, Imperialist. The title was given in scorn by the Eutychians to the Catholic party, because they were upheld by the Emperor Marcian (450-57).

before the incoming of the Crusaders there were anywhere to be found native Syrians following the liturgy of the Catholic Church of Rome. In all probability, the settling down in Syria and Palestine of many of those who followed in the wake of the Crusaders, as well as owing to the great influence which the presence of the Christian armies of the West exercised over the Christian populations both within as well as beyond the boundaries of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, contributed in a great measure to the forming of such communities. Members of the disunited Eastern Churches came over to unity, and placed themselves under the jurisdiction of the Latin clergy. Traces of this influence exercised by the presence of the Crusaders in the East over the Eastern Churches can be found in many instances. It was owing to it principally that the Maronite Church shook off all taint of Monothelism and became united with Rome. Indeed it was quite natural that such a tendency should exist. Crushed by the tyranny of the Moslem, Christians beyond the frontier of the Latin kingdom looked for help and sympathy to the warriors which the Latin Church had sent to the East to win back the sanctuaries of Christianity from the grasp of the followers of Islam, and crush the tyranny of the Moslem world. All this would sufficiently account for the establishment of Latin communities in the heart of the Eastern Churches, quite apart from the strenuous efforts made by the missionaries which Rome sent to the East during the middle ages, and even up to the present; but to speak of those missions is hardly beside the subject of the present essay; and so it must be left to be told elsewhere. What has been here said will be quite sufficient to refute the absurd statements found in many English hand-books on Palestine, among others that of Murray, where it is stated (page 23):¹ "The Papal schismatic (*sic*) Churches are called the Greek-Catholic, or Melchite, and the Syrian Catholic. These have sprung up from the missionary efforts of Romish priests and Jesuits during the past two centuries!"

¹ Confer, Murray's *Handbook, Syria and Palestine*. London, 1875.

This statement is simply false and misleading in the extreme. Converts made by Romish missionaries from any of the non-united Churches become *ipso facto* Latins, and not Melchites, &c. The fact is, that, with but few exceptions, all the united branches of the Eastern Churches date back to those times when heresy and schism tore their Church asunder; to a period long anterior to any so-called invasion of Roman missionaries. The sole instances of any account where Roman missionaries have had anything to do with the bringing back to unity with Catholicity any of the Eastern Churches, or parts of those Churches, are such as took place from the fourteenth century up to the Council of Florence. Now and then a community of the non-united Churches expresses its willingness to become united with Rome, and in such cases alone does that particular community retain its old liturgy, and so fall under the jurisdiction of the Syrian, Armenian, or Coptic Catholic bishop, as the case may be, and not under the Latin clergy. A new edition of Murray's handbook for Syria and Palestine is about to be brought out, and it is to be hoped that as it will naturally be availed of by English Catholic tourists in these countries, such like false and misleading statements will be corrected, as well as others regarding the management, &c., of the sanctuaries.

The Latin Church in the East, including Egypt, and apart from its missionary work—merely regarding it as an established Church, guarding the native communities under its jurisdiction—is at present divided into four principal vicar apostolicates, several prefectures apostolic and has an archbishopric at Smyrna, and a resident patriarch at Jerusalem. These four vicariates apostolic for the government of the Latin communities within their districts are ruled over by so many apostolic delegates whose duty it is to represent the Holy See in all matters concerning the Eastern united Churches. Thus the apostolic delegate of Alexandria,¹ in Egypt, acts as such for the Coptic Church;

¹ Monsignor Guido Corbelli, O.S.F., formerly *Custos Terræ Sanctæ*, nominated 1888.

the apostolic delegate of Beyrouth,¹ for all those parts of the Armenian, Syrian, Greek (Nulchite) and Chaldean Catholics in all Syria and Palestine; the apostolic delegate in Mossul,² for the Chaldean Church in Mesopotamia and Eastern Armenia; and the apostolic delegate of Constantinople³ for the remaining parts of the Turkish Empire. Up to 1837 the Coptic Church, in union with Rome, was under the apostolic delegate of Syria,⁴ but since then a separate delegation has been appointed, with residence in Alexandria. A resident patriarch was appointed for Jerusalem in 1847, the last presiding patriarch, previous to then, having left Palestine upon the fall of the last stronghold of the Crusaders, *i. e.*, Acre, in 1291, and the Custos of the Franciscans in Jerusalem, during the long interval acting as vicar apostolic. The difficulties which had up to then existed, prevented the appointment of a resident patriarch to that venerable See; but with the dawn of religious liberty, even under the Crescent, Pius IX. succeeded in appointing Mons. Valerga.⁵

Thus it is that in almost every town and city in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, as well as all along the coast of Asia Minor proper, are to be found native communities following the liturgy of the Western Church, and many, if not most of them, dating their establishment back to the days of the Crusaders. Roughly speaking, in Egypt and Syria, the Latin communities are, with few exceptions, under the jurisdiction of the Franciscans of the Holy Land. They are, however, ably assisted by the Jesuits and Lazarists; the former having splendid colleges in Cairo, Alexandria, and in Beyrout, besides numbers of schools in different parts of Syria. At present the Lazarists

¹ Monsignor Gaudenzio Bonfigli, O.S.F., late Custos of the Holy Land, appointed Delegate Apostolic for Syria, 1889.

² Monsignor Altmayer, O.P., present incumbent.

³ Present incumbent, Monsignor Bonetti.

⁴ Confer. Alzog., *Universal Church History*, vol. iv., page 320.

⁵ Died Dec. 2nd, 1872; succeeded by Mons. Bracco, who died June. 1889; present patriarch, Monsig. Lodovico Piavi, O.S.F., late Delegate Apostolic for Syria, and Vicar Apostolic for the Vicariate of Aleppo.

have but few residences in Syria. In Mesopotamia the Latin communities are under the jurisdiction of the vicar apostolic of Mossul, who, with a number of French Dominicans, look after the Latin Catholics in all that part of the Turkish Empire. Armenia has likewise numerous Latin communities, which are under the care of the Capuchins and Jesuits; the former being in Trebizond, Kars, Erzeroum, Mardin, Kharpoot, Orfa, and other places of minor importance. In the other parts of Asia Minor, along the Archipelago, the Lazarists and Capuchins are the clergy in charge of the Latins.

To enter into a minute detail of the missionary work carried out by these religious bodies would be impossible in these pages; so the writer leaves that for another time; nor would it be possible to give anything like an account of the Churches which Protestantism has, during the past forty years or so, been endeavouring to found in the East. Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Anglicans, have alike tried their hand to establish themselves in the East; but the only section anywhere worth notice, or numerous, is that of the American Congregationalists, who have many adherents in various parts of Armenia. The Anglican Church having disastrously failed to keep up the sham of a bishopric in Jerusalem, the two sections of the Protestant community there, *i.e.*, the United Lutheran, and the few Anglicans, have been unable to agree to pull together under the terms arranged for them by the Prussian and English Governments in 1857. At present each section has its own bishop; but, as a matter of course, the whole thing will soon fall through, owing to the few members, especially of the Anglican Church, and to *want of funds*.

Such, then, is a brief account of the actual state of the East, as far as its Churches are concerned. The reader may ask himself what are the prospects of any of those Churches—of Catholicity itself—of Islamism—of Protestantism; but to such a demand, it is impossible at present to give an adequate or satisfactory reply. Perhaps history may give that reply. They arose, and they have fallen. They sprung from that Gospel preached by twelve peasants from lowly

Galilee, crushing as they sprung into life the mighty spell with which the myths of Assyria, Egypt, and Greece, enthralled the civilized world of those days; they fell before the barbarian hordes that rushed to death under the banner of Mahomet. Their glory has departed. Sees, the names of which can never be forgotten in the annals of civilization, are now the homes of the Bedouin of the desert. Assuredly Providence foresaw all this—perhaps willed it. What that same Providence may decree in the future, it is impossible to tell, or even to imagine. What may happen, what Western Christianity would fain accomplish in order to uplift her fallen sister, the Church of the East; what efforts she is now putting forth in order to accomplish that end; what have been both in the past, as well as at present, the successes or failures which her efforts have encountered—all that enters into what may be said about her missions; and that must be reserved for another time.

J. L. LYNCH, O.S.F.

DUBIORUM LITURGICORUM SOLUTIO.¹

IS ONE JUSTIFIED IN USING SUCH BOOKS AS PUSTET'S
 "COMPENDIUM ANTIPHONARII ET BREVIARII ROMANI,"
 &C.,² IN DISCHARGING THE OBLIGATION OF THE DIVINE
 OFFICE?

QUESTIO.

Plures extant libri liturgici, quos Typographus Fridericus Pustet excerptit ex aliis typicis et in lucem prodit, sed vel nullam vel approbationem specialem non praeseferunt, ut ex. gr. Cantus officiorum Nativitatis D. N. I. C.—Tridui sacri—Diurnale parvum—Cantus diversi—etc. Ex iis autem nonnulli pro approbatione habent: *Imprimi permittitur*, vel,

¹ We are indebted to the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (Romae) for the following interesting questions.—ED. I. E. R.

² These books have the *Imprimatur* of the Vicar-General, but not the attestation of the bishop that they agree with the Editio Typica.

Imprimatur die 12 Iunii, 1889, G. Erlembrohn Vic. in Spiritual, Gen. Nonnulli autem nullam approbationem habent, dicitur tamen ex typica editione eos esse excerptos. Quaeritur ergo, utrum qui ad Horas Canonicas tenetur, cum his libris officium recitans satisfaciat nec ne?

RESPONSIO.

Triplex in casu institui potest quaestio: prima, num eiusmodi approbatio in casu valeat: secunda, utrum regularis approbatio in casu requiratur: tertia, utrum officium in eiusmodi libris recitans satisfaciat.

Primam resolvimus *negative*. Fridericus Pustet est Typographus S. R. Congregationis: ut sacri codices omnes qui ab ea vulgantur, peculiarem habeant ab eadem S. C. revisionem et approbationem, et maxime primas sacrorum librorum editiones, quae pro typicis, seu ad imitandum propositis (non tamen ad errores quod attinet, si quos habeant), sunt ab omnibus retinendae.

Quinimo ad abundantiam, ut credimus, etiam Ordinarius loci suam approbationem ponere maluit, uti constat nobis esse factum circa secundam Pontificalis et Ritualis Romani Editionem. Ut proinde has Editiones esse vere authenticas dubitare nemo rationabiliter valeat.

At in casu agitur de aliquibus partibus, a libris quidem authenticis excerptis, sed nulla S. R. Congregationis approbatione gaudentibus. Iam vero oportet, ut ad Horas Canonicas obligatus certo sciat ex attestazione Episcopi, editionem qua utitur, cum typica concordare. Atqui id non dicit attestatio Vicarii in Spiritualibus Generalis, declarans simpliciter, editionem aliquam fuisse e typica depromptam. Quamvis enim id verum esse constet, quibusdam tamen mutationibus obnoxia esse potuit, ut dissonet a typica. Ergo approbatio, de qua in casu, nullius est ponderis, ut tamquam non sufficiens habenda sit, proindeque non valeat.

Ad alterum respondemus *affirmative*, hoc est: in praefatis editionibus omnino requiri regularem approbationem Episcopi loci. Et sane, quicumque ex Typographis, accepta facultate, liturgicos libros valet edere, in iisque edendis, typicis editionibus tenetur uti. Verum sufficietne lectores

monere, illos libros fuisse ex authenticis editionibus excerptos? Negative ex super allata ratione; requiritur enim ut Episcopus declaret, novas editiones revera concordare cum typica. Constat id satis ex S. R. Congregationis Decreto Generali 4739, vi cuius, Ordinarii locorum testari in singulis editionibus tenentur, nova exemplaria concordare cum iis, quae Romae sunt impressa, impraesenti vero, cum typicis. Ita factum cernimus in cunctis recentioribus editionibus, ut in Tornacensi per *Desclée*, in Mechliniensi per *Dessain*, in Taurinensi per *Marietti*, etc. Nec ratio est, ob quam a lege hac tenenda eximantur editiones, licet a typicis depromptae, quas Fridericus Pustet evulgat. Licet ergo iste, Typographi honore fruatur S. R. Congregationis, quando haec suam approbationem non ponit, ut in casu evenit, in illius editionibus, eam ponere tenetur loci Episcopus. Qui testari de more debet, non iam illas editiones esse excerptas e typica, quod supponitur, sed cum typica perfecte concordare.

Ad alterum denique quod pertinet, respondemus, seriam non posse institui quaestionem, utrum qui in libro liturgico approbatione Episcopi carente, officium recitat, satisfaciat obligationi, si tamen officii forma illa sit, quam S. Pius V in sua Bulla *Quod a nobis* requirit. Ratio est, quia etsi liber approbatione Episcopi careat, nihilominus forma officii Bullae S. Pii V perfecte respondet, ut supponimus, sub qua idem Sanctus Pontifex Horas Canonicas recitari praescribit. Arrogas, librum in casu non carere approbatione quod forma praescripta deficiat, sed ex alia causa, puta ex incuria, ex falsa hypothesi, vi cuius approbatione haud indigere censetur etc. alioquin eadem approbatione non careret. Cum ergo forma officii ea certo sit, quam Ecclesia exigit, indubia est quoque satisfactio, neque aliud erui potest ex praefata Bulla.

Attamen codices sine approbatione edere aut vulgare non licet, et severius loquendo, nec cum iis officium recitare. Idque, sive ut legi inhaereamus, quae eiusmodi attestationem vult, sive ut incommoda evitemus, quae ex hac legis inobservantia derivare possunt.

SHOULD THE PSALM "DE PROFUNDIS" AND THE PRAYER "FILEDIUM DEUS OMNIUM" BE SAID BY THE CELEBRANT AND CLERGY AFTER THE ABSOLUTION AT THE CATAFALQUE?

QUESTIO.

Post Absolutionem ad tumulum, quae quotidie peragitur post Missam cum cantu, secundum quod haec de die est aut de requie, Celebrans post *De profundis* in reditu ad sacrum recitatum, debetne recitare Orationem *Fidelium* cum suis praecedentibus versibus, uti indicare videntur quidam libri liturgici Ratisbonae editi?

RESPONSIO.

Ante dubii solutionem animadvertere liceat, dubium aliquam prae se ferre obscuritatem in illis verbis *secundum quod Missa, est de die aut de requie*; videtur enim innuere, posse eiusmodi absolutionem fieri seu post Missam de die, seu post Missam de requie. Iuvet itaque observare, si ita res se habet, id esse prohibitum, et Absolutionem pro defunctis post Missam de die fieri non posse, nisi sit omnino a Missa separata et independens, quod certo constat ex pluribus decretis.

Ad dubium propositum respondemus, Rubricam Missalis Typici pro Agendis defunctorum, esse: "Quibus expeditis (*Absolutione praesente cadavere*), omnes in sacristiam . . . revertentes, voce submissa, sed intelligibili, Celebrans dicit *Si iniquitates*, inde alternatim cum choro Psalm. *De profundis*, etc." Hae autem preces per Orationem *Fidelium* cum consuetis versiculis concluduntur. Idem servandum esse iubet in Absolutione absente cadavere. Id Rituale non habet profecto; sed Missale typicum observandum esse quomodo dubitari potest?

IS THE ANTIPHON "SI INIQUITATES" TO BE SAID IN FULL, AT THE BEGINNING OF THE PSALM WHICH IS SAID BEFORE THE BODY IS BORNE TO THE CHURCH?

RESPONSIO.

Negative. Rubrica Ritualis ita se exprimit: "Parochus vero antequam cadaver efferatur, aspergit aqua benedicta,

mox dicit antiphonam *Si iniquitates* cum psalmo *De profundis*, etc. In fine . . . repetit antiphonam totam *Si iniquitates observaveris Domine, Domine quis sustinebit* (tit. vi., cap. 3, n. 2).” Licet Rubrica habeat verbum *dicit* in initio, cum habere potuisset *inchoat*, unde non adeo perspicua hic dici posset; nihilominus, si perpendatur totius antiphonae inscriptio in fine, satis dignoscitur, n initio esse solummodo inchoandam. Insuper in fine Rubrica dicit: *Repetit antiphonam totam*; ergo supponit, eam inchoari tantum prima vice. Praeterea unitas functionis fert, ut non duplicatur antiphona, sicut non duplicatur *Exultabunt Domino* dum cadaver effertur. Insuper natura ritus minus solemnis idem quoque suggerit. Denique ita quoque expresse De Herdt docet, citatque Cavalerii auctoritatem; et eiusmodi fert etiam romana consuetudo.

SHOULD THE PECTORAL CROSS APPEAR OVER THE
CHASUBLE AT MASS ?

QUESTIO.

Episcopi non debent, sicut Sacerdotes, stolam induentes pro Missa, in crucis formam componere, profecto ut crux pectoralis in iisdem Episcopis appareat. Ergo ea non videtur subtus casulam recondenda esse, sed potius supra, ut appareat. Insuper pretiosiores cruces, quibus Episcopi saepe donantur ex liberalitate summi Pontificis, peculiariter donari videntur pro Pontificalibus agendis; verum, si contegi debent planeta, fere inutile evadit donum. Nonne ergo defendi sententia potest, docens, Episcopos iure merito posse gestare super casulam pectoralem crucem, seu in Missa privata, seu in Pontificalibus ?

RESPONSIO.

Ut ab ultima, quam Rmus. Inquirens exponit, animadversione incipiamus, dicendum imprimis est, Summum Pontificem, cum singulari nonnullos ex Episcopis benevolentia prosequens, speciali aliquo sacro dono afficit, nil aliud posse pro fine habere, nisi ut dona adhibeantur,

prouti liturgicae leges postulant. Neque aliter iudicari potest, quin sapientiae, qua Pontifices excellere oportet, et excellunt, gravis inferatur iniuria. Sane, nonne risu dignus diceretur, qui assereret, Episcopum aliquem, puta Titularem, posse ad libitum in quacumque sacra functione baculo pastorali uti, quod illum dono a summo Pontifice acceperit? Similiter quis pretiosorem posset deferre stolam super planetam, quia illa pariter a Summo Pontifice donatus fuit. Quaestio itaque ad hoc reducitur, ut sciamus, qualis esse debeat crucis, pectoralis usus in functionibus liturgicis, iuxta rituales leges, hunc enim solum sibi praefigere finem possunt Pontifices, dum sacrum aliquod Episcopis largiuntur donum. At sponte se offert lex Caeremonialis Episcoporum, quae docet: “Diaconus . . . sumpta Cruce pectorali, eamque etiam in parte prius osculatam, ipsi Episcopo osculandam praebet, et eius collo imponit, ita ut ante pectus pendeat (lib. ii., cap viii., n. 14).” Postea, cum agit de casula induenda, prosequitur: “Mox surgit Episcopus, et induitur ab eisdem planeta, quae hinc inde super brachia aptatur et revolvitur diligenter, ne illum impediat (loc. cit., n. 19).” Altum ergo de cruce pectorali extra casulam ponenda silentium servat lex, ut omnino arbitrarium foret, si id fieret. Insuper lex agit explicite de omnibus pontificalibus ornamentis atque etiam de cruce, et praescribit ordinem, quo indui iis debet Episcopus. Iam vero crucem, iuxta legem. Episcopus debet accipere post albam et singulum (*Caerem.*, loc. cit., n. 13), ergo nequaquam post casulam. At si cruce ante stolam induendus est Episcopus, haud post casulam, videtur omnino contra legem ponere crucem post planetam; quia si id lex voluisset, minime tacuisset, sed dixisset potius, crucem post casulam esse induendam. Parum enim vel nihil interesse poterat, ut intus vel extra maneret catenula, sed obiectum Caeremonialis erat crux. Cum ergo crucem ante casulam induendam ordinet Caeremoniale, iam patet, si quid videmus, illam debere subter, haud super, casulam remanere.

Ad rem cl. Martinuccius, cuius textualia verba referre iuvat: “Paramentis sacris indui debet Episcopus eo ordine, quo indicatur a Caeremoniali Episcoporum et Rubricis Gene-

ralibus Missalis Romani. Episcopus stolam in pectore non decussat, ut praescribitur Presbyteris, eo quod utitur cruce pectorali, quam debet induere ante stolam. Quocirca crux pectoralis debet semper superstare Albae . . . Si Episcopus deberet crucem praedictam super planetam ponere, praeterquamquod hoc a Rubricis praescriberetur, non solum deberet stolam in pectore decussare, sed induere crucem post planetam ipsam. Summus Pontifex in celebrando Sacro, tum privato tum solemni, semper utitur cruce pectorali, nec unquam eam extrahit et reponit super planetam, sed retinet super Alba. Hinc infertur, quod contra regulas quidam Caeremoniarum magistri docent Episcopos, ut ponant crucem pectoralem super planetam, etc. (*Manual. Caerem.*, lib. v., cap. ix., n. 60, not. a.)

Ex dictis infertur etiam, allatam a Rmo. Inquirente rationem stolae non decussandae ut crux appareat, quid speciosi praeserere quidem, sed non veritatis. Etenim Caeremoniale exigit, ut stola non sit ante pectus *transversa in modum crucis, sed aequaliter ante pectus pendeat* (loc. cit., n. 14). Missale vero dicit: "Si Celebrans sit Episcopus . . . non ducit stolam ante pectus in modum crucis, sed sinit hinc inde utrasque extremitates pendere (*Rit. serv. in celebr. Missae.*, tit. 1, n. 4)." Ergo ratio unica, ex lege patens, ob quam stola in Episcopis non decussatur, est crux pectoralis: adeo ut, sicuti Sacerdotibus est decussanda ut crucem ante pectus habeant, ita non decussanda Episcopis, quia crucem pectoralem induunt. Verum sicut in Presbyteris non debet videri stola, ad modum crucis tamen, ita neque crux pectoralis in Episcopis. Ergo non possumus, quin respondeamus ad propositum dubium, *negative*.

Document.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII.
"DE CONDITIONE OPIIFICUM."

(Concluded.)

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE
XIII. LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES
ARCHIEPISCOPOS ET EPISCOPOS UNIVERSOS CATHOLICI ORBIS
GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

DE CONDITIONE OPIIFICUM.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIB
ET EPISCOPIB UNIVERSIS CATHOLICI ORBIS GRATIAM ET COM-
MUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Rem hoc loco attingimus sat magni momenti : quae recte intelligatur necesse est, in alterutram partem ne peccetur. Videlicet salarii definitur libero consensu modus : itaque dominus rei, pacta mercede persoluta, liberavisse fidem, nec ultra debere quidquam videatur. Tunc solum fieri injuste, si vel pretium dominus solidum, vel obligatas artifex operas reddere totas recusaret : his caussis rectum esse potestatem politicam intercedere, ut suum cuique jus incolume sit, sed praeterea nullis. Cui augmentationi aequus rerum iudex non facile, neque in totum assentiatur, quia non est absoluta omnibus partibus : momentum quoddam rationis abest maximi ponderis. Hoc est enim operari, exercere se rerum comparandarum caussa, quae sint ad varios vitae usus, potissimumque ad tuitionem sui necessariae. *In sudore vultus tui vesceris pane.*¹ Itaque duas velut notas habet in homine labor natura insitas, nimirum ut *personalis* sit, quia vis agens adhaeret personae, atque ejus omnino est propria, a quo exercetur, et cujus est utilitati nata : deinde ut sit *necessarius*, ob hanc caussam, quod fructus laborum est homini opus ad vitam tuendam : vitam autem tueri ipsa rerum, cui maxime parendum, natura jubet. Jamvero si ex ea dumtaxat parte spectetur quod *personalis* est, non est dubium quin integrum opifici sit pactae mercedis angustius

¹ Gen. iii. 19.

finire modum : quemadmodum enim operas dat ille voluntate, sic et operarum mercede vel tenui vel plane nulla contentus esse voluntate potest. Sed longe aliter judicandum si cum ratione *personalitatis* ratio conjungitur *necessitatis*, cogitatione quidem non re ab illa separabilis. Reapse manere in vita, commune singulis officium est, cui scelus est deesse. Hinc jus reperiendarum rerum, quibus vita sustentatur, necessario nascitur; quarum rerum facultatem infimo cuique non nisi quaesita labore merces suppeditat. Esto igitur, ut opifex atque herus libere in idem placitum, ac nominatim in salarii modum consentiant: subest tamen semper aliquid ex justitia naturali, idque libera paciscantium voluntate majus et antiquius, scilicet alendo opifici, frugi quidem et bene morato, haud imparem esse mercedem oportere. Quod si necessitate opifex coactus, aut mali peioris metu pernotus duriolem conditionem accipiat, quae, etiamsi nolit, accipienda sit, quod a domino vel a redemptore operum imponitur, istud quidem est subire vim, cui justitia reclamat.

Verumtamen in his similibusque caussis, quales illae sunt in unoquoque genere artificii quota sit elaborandum hora, quibus praesidiis valetudini maxime in officinis cavendum, ne magistratus inferat sese importunius, praesertim cum adjuncta tam varia sint rerum, temporum, locorum, satius erit eas res judicio reservare collegiorum, de quibus infra dicturi sumus, aut aliam inire viam, qua rationes mercenariorum, uti par est, salvae sint, accedente, si res postulaverit, tutela praesidioque reipublicae.

Mercedem si ferat opifex satis amplam ut ea se uxoremque et liberos tueri commodum queat, facile studebit parsimoniae, si sapit, efficietque, quod ipsa videtur natura monere, ut detractis sumptibus, aliquid etiam redundet, quo sibi liceat ad modicum censum pervenire. Neque enim efficaci ratione dirimi caussam, de qua agitur, posse vidimus, nisi hoc sumpto et constituto, jus privatorum bonorum sanctum esse oportere. Quamobrem favere huic jurileges debent, et quoad potest, providere ut quamplurimi ex multitudine rem habere malint. Quo facto, praeclarae utilitates consecuturae sunt; ac primum certe aequior partitio bonorum. Vis enim commutationum civilium in duas civium classes divisit urbes, immenso inter utrumque discrimine interjecto. Ex una parte factio praepotens, quia praedives: quae cum operum et mercaturae universum genus sola potiatur, facultatem omnem copiarum effectricem ad sua commoda ac rationes trahit, atque in ipsa administratione reipublicae non parum potest. Ex

altera inops atque infirma multitudo, exulcerato animo et ad turbas semper parato. Jamvero si plebis excitetur industria in spem adipiscendi quippiam, quod solo contineatur, sensim fiet ut alter ordo evadet finitimus alteri, sublato inter summas divitias summamque egestatem discrimine—Praeterea rerum, quas terra gignit, major est abundantia futura. Homines enim, cum se elaborare sciunt in suo, alacritatem adhibent studiumque longe majus: immo prorsus adamare terram instituunt sua manu percultam, unde non alimenta tantum, sed etiam quamdam copiam et sibi et suis expectant. Ista voluntatis alacritas, nemo non videt quam valde conferat ad ubertatem fructuum, augendasque divitias civitatis. Ex quo illud tertio loco manabit commodi, ut qua in civitate homines editi susceptique in lucem sint, ad eam facile retineantur: neque enim patriam cum externa regione commutarent, si vitae degendae tolerabilem daret patria facultatem. Non tamen ad haec commoda perveniri nisi ea conditione potest, ut privatus census ne exhauriatur immanitate tributorum et vectigalium. Jus enim possidendi privatim bona cum non sit lege hominum sed natura datum, non ipsum abolere, sed tantummodo ipsius usum temperare et cum communi bono componere auctoritas publica potest. Faciat igitur injuste atque inhumane, si de bonis privatorum plus aequo, tributorum nomine, detraxerit.

Postremo domini ipsique opifices multum hac in caussa possunt, iis videlicet institutis, quorum ope et opportune subveniatur indigentibus, et ordo alter proprius accedat ad alterum. Numeranda in hoc genere sodalitia ad suppetias mutuo ferendas: res varias, privatorum providentia constitutas, ad cavendum opifici, itemque orbitati uxoris et liberorum, si quid subitum ingruat, si quid subitum ingruat, si debilitas affligerit, si quid humanitas accidat: instituti patronatus pueris, puellis, adolescentibus natumque majoribus tutandis. Sed principem locum obtinent sodalitia artificum, quorum complexu fere cetera continentur. Fabrum corporatorum apud majores nostros diu bene facta constitere. Revera non modo utilitates praeclaras artificibus, sed artibus ipsis, quod perplura monumenta testantur, decus atque incrementum peperere. Eruditior nunc aetate, moribus novis, auctis etiam rebus quas vita quotidiana desiderat, profecto sodalitia opificum flecti ad praesentem usum necesse est. Vulgo coiri ejus generis societates, sive totas ex opificibus conflatas, sive ex utroque ordine mixtas, gratum est: optandum vero ut numero

et actiosa virtute crescant. Etsi vero de iis non semel verba fecimus, placet tamen hoc loco ostendere, eas esse valde opportunas, et jure suo coalescere: item qua illas disciplina uti, et quid agere oporteat.

Virium suarum explorata exiguitas impellit hominem atque hortatur, ut opem sibi alienam velit adjungere. Sacrarum litterarum est illa sententia: *Melius est duos esse simul, quam unum: habent enim emolumentum societatis suae. Si unus ceciderit, ab altero fulcietur. Vae soli: quia cum ceciderit non habet sublevantem se.*¹ Atque illa quoque: *Frater, qui adjuvatur a fratre, quasi civitas firma.*² Hac homo propensione naturali sicut ad conjunctionem ducitur congregationemque civilem, sic et alias cum civibus inire societates expetit, exiguas illas quidem nec perfectas, sed societates tamen. Inter has et magnam illam societatem ob differentes causas proximas interest plurimum. Finis enim societati civili propositus pertinet ad universos, quoniam communi continetur bono: cujus omnes et singulos proportionem compotes esse jus est. Quare appellatur *publica* quia per eam *homines sibi invicem communicant in una republica constituenda.*³ Contra vero, quae in ejus velut sinu junguntur societates, privatae habentur et sunt, quia videlicet illud, quo proxime spectant, privata utilitas est ad solos pertinens consociatos. *Privata autem societas est, quae ad aliquod negotium privatum exercendum conjungitur, sicut quod duo vel tres societatem ineunt, ut simul negotientur.*⁴ Nunc vero quamquam societates privatae existunt in civitate, ejusque sunt velut partes totidem, tamen universe ac per se non est in potestate reipublicae ne existant prohibere. Privatas enim societates inire concessum est homini jure naturae: est autem ad praesidium juris naturalis instituta civitas, non ad interitum: eaque si civium coetus sociari vetuerit, plane secum pugnancia agat, propterea quod tam ipsa quam coetus privati uno hoc e principio nascuntur quod homines sunt natura congregabiles.

Incidunt aliquando tempora cum ei generi communitatum rectum sit leges obsistere: scilicet si quidquam ex instituto persequantur, quod cum probitate, cum justitia, cum reipublicae salute aperte dissideat. Quibus in causis jure quidem potestas

¹ Eccl. iv. 9-12.

² Prov. xviii. 19.

³ S. Thom. *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*, cap. ii.

⁴ *Ib.*

publica, quo minus illae coalescant, impedit: jure etiam dissolvat coalitas: summam tamen adhibeat cautionem necesse est, ne jura civium migrare videatur, neu quidquam per speciem utilitates publicae statuatur quod ratio non probet. Eatenus enim obtemperandum legibus, quoad cum recta ratione adeoque cum lege Dei sempiterna consentiant.¹

Sodalitates varias hic reputamus animo et collegia et ordines religiosos, quos Ecclesiae auctoritas et pia christianorum voluntas genuerant: quanta vero cum salute gentis humanae, usque ad nostram memoriam historia loquitur. Societates ejusmodi, si ratio sola dijudicet, cum initae honesta causa sint, jure naturali initas apparet fuisse. Qua vero parte religionem attingunt, sola est Ecclesiae cui juste pareant. Non igitur in eas quicquam sibi arrogare juris, nec earum ad se traducere administrationem recte possunt qui praesint civitati: eas potius officium est reipublicae vereri, conservare, et, ubi res postulaverint, injuria prohibere. Quod tamen longe aliter fieri hoc praesertim tempore vidimus. Multis locis communitates hujus generis respública violavit, ac multiplex quidem injuria: cum et civilium legum nexu devinxerit, et legitimo jure personae moralis exuerit, et fortunis suis despoliarit. Quibus in fortunis suum habeat Ecclesia jus, suum singuli sodales, item qui eas certae cuidam causae addixerant, et quorum essent commodo ac solatio addictae. Quamobrem temperare animo non possumus quin spoliaciones ejusmodi tam injustas ac perniciosas conqueramus, eo vel magis quod societatibus catholicorum virorum, pacatis iis quidem et in omnes partes utilibus, iter praecludi videmus, quo tempore edicatur, utique coire in societatem per leges licere: eaque facultas large revera hominibus permittitur consilia agentibus religioni simul ac reipublicae perniciosa.

Profecto consociationum diversissimarum maxime ex opificibus, longe nunc major, quam alias frequentia. Plures unde ortum ducant, quid velint, qua grassentur via, non est hujus loci quaerere. Opinio tamen est, multis confirmata rebus, praeesse ut plurimum occultiores auctores, eosdemque disciplinam adhibere non christiano nomini, non saluti civitatum consentaneam: occupataque

¹ *Lex humana in tantum habet rationem legis, in quantum est secundum rationem rectam, et secundum hoc manifestum, est quod a lege aeterna derivatur. In quantum vero a ratione recedit, sic dicitur lex iniqua, et sic non habet rationem legis, sed magis violentiae cujusdam* (S. Thom. Summ. Theol. i.-ii., Quaest. xiii., a. iii.)

efficiendorum operum universitate, id agere ut qui secum consociari recusarint, luere poenas egestate cogantur. Hoc rerum statu, alterutrum malint artifices christiani oportet, aut nomen collegiis dare, unde periculum religioni extimescendum: aut sua inter se sodalitia condere, viresque hoc pacto conjungere, quo se animose queant ab illa injusta ac non ferenda oppressione redimere. Omnino optari hoc alterum necesse esse, quam potest dubitationem apud eos habere, qui nolint summum hominis bonum in praesentissimum discrimen conjicere?

Valde quidem laudandi complures ex nostris, qui probe perspecto quid a se tempora postulent, experiuntur ac tentant qua ratione proletarios ad meliora adducere honestis artibus possint. Quorum patrocínio suscepto, prosperitatem augere cum domesticam tum singulorum student: item moderari cum aequitate vincula, quibus invicem artifices et domini continentur: alere et confirmare in utrisque memoriam officii atque evangelicorum custodiam praeceptorum; quae quidem praecepta, hominem ab intemperantia revocando, excedere modum vetant, personarumque et rerum dissimillimo statu harmoniam in civitate tuentur. Hac de caussa unum in locum saepe convenire videmus viros egregios, quo communicent consilia invicem, viresque jungant, et quid maxime expedire videatur, consultent. Alii varium genus artificum opportuna copulare societate student; consilio ac re juvant, opus ne desit honestum ac fructuosum, provident. Alacritatem addunt ac patrocínium impertiunt Episcopi: quorum auctoritate auspiciisque plures ex utroque ordine cleri, quae ad excolendum animum pertinent, in consociatis sedulo curant. Denique catholici non desunt copiosis divitiis, sed mercenariorum velut consortes voluntarii, qui constituere lateque fundere grandi pecunia conso-ciationes adnitantur: quibus adjuvantibus facile opifici liceat non modo commoda praesentia, sed etiam honestae quietis futurae fiduciam sibi labore quaerere. Tam multiplex tamque alacris industria quantum attulerit rebus communibus boni plus est cognitum, quam ut attineat dicere. Hinc jam bene de reliquo tempore sperandi auspicia sumimus, modo societates istiusmodi constanter incrementa capiant, ac prudenti temperatione constuantur. Tutetur hos respublica civium coetus jure sociatos: ne trumat tamen sese in eorum intimam rationem ordinemque vitae: vitalis enim motus cietur ab interiore principio, ac facillime sane pulsu eliditur externo.

Est profecto temperatio ac diciplina prudens ad eam rem

necessaria ut consensus in agendo fiat conspiratioque voluntatum. Proinde si libera civibus coeundi facultas est, ut profecto est, jus quoque esse oportet eam libere optare disciplinam, easque leges quae maxime conducere ad id, quod propositum est, judicentur.

Eam, quae memorata est temperationem disciplinamque collegiorum qualem esse in partibus suis in singulis oporteat, decerni certis definitisque regulis non censemus posse, cum id potius statuendum sit ex ingenio cujusque gentis, ex periclitatione et usu, ex genere atque efficientia operum, ex amplitudine commerciorum, aliisque rerum ac temporum adjunctis, quae sunt prudenter ponderanda. Ad summam rem quod spectat, haec tamquam lex generalis ac perpetua sancitur, ita constitui itaque gubernari opificum collegia oportere, ut instrumenta suppeditent aptissima maximeque expedita ad id quod est propositum, quodque in eo consistit ut singuli e societate incrementum bonorum corporis, animi, rei familiaris, quoad potest, assequantur. Perspicuum vero est, ad perfectionem pietatis et morum tamquam ad causam praecipuam spectari oportere: eaque potissimum causa disciplinam socialem penitus dirigendam. Secus enim degenerarent in aliam formam, eique generi collegiorum, in quibus nulla ratio religionis haberi solet, haud sane multum praestarent. Ceterum quid prosit opifici rerum copiam societate quaesisse, si ob inopiam cibi sui de salute periclitetur anima? *Quid prodest homini, si mundum universum lucretur, animae vero suae detrimentum patiatur.*¹ Hanc quidem docet Christus Dominus velut notam habendam, qua ab ethnico distinguatur homo christianus: *Haec omnia gentes inquirunt . . . quaerite primum regnum Dei et iustitiam ejus, et haec omnia adjicientur vobis.*² Sumptis igitur a Deo principiis, plurimum eruditioni religiosae tribuatur loci, ut sua singuli adversus Deum officia cognoscant: quid credere oporteat, quid sperare atque agere salutis sempiternae causa, probe sciant: cura praecipua adversus opinionum errores variasque corruptelas muniantur. Ad Dei cultum studiumque pietatis excitetur opifex, nominatim ad religionem dierum festorum colendam. Vereri diligereque communem omnium parentem Ecclesiam condiscat: itemque ejus et obtemperare praeceptis e sacramenta frequentare, quae sunt ad expiandas animi labes sanctitatemque comparandam instrumenta divina.

¹ Matth. xvi. 26.

² Matth. vi. 32, 33.

Socialium legum posito in religione fundamento, pronum est iter ad stabiliendas sociorum rationes mutuas, ut convictus quietus ac res florentes consequantur. Munia sodalitatum dispartienda sunt ad communes rationes accommodata, atque ita quidem ut consensum ne minuat dissimilitudo. Officia partiri intelligenter, perspicueque definiri, plurimum ob hanc causam interest, ne cui fiat injuria. Commune administretur integre, ut ex indigentia singulorum praefiniatur opitulandi modus : jura officiaque dominorum cum juribus officiisque opificum apte conveniant. Si qui ex alterutro ordine violatum se ulla re putarit, nihil optandum magis, quam adesse ejusdem corporis viros prudentes atque integros, quorum arbitrio litem dirimi leges ipsae sociales jubeant. Illud quoque magnopere providendum ut copia operis nullo tempore deficiat opificem, utque vectigal suppeditet, unde necessitati singulorum subveniatur nec solum in subitis ac fortuitis industriae casibus, sed etiam cum valetudo, aut senectus, aut infortunium quemquam oppressit.

His legibus, si modo voluntate accipiantur, satis erit tenuiorem commodis ac saluti consultum : consociationes autem catholicorum non minimum ad prosperitatem momenti in civitate sunt habiturae. Ex eventis praeteritis non temere providemus futura. Truditur enim aetas aetate, sed rerum gestarum mirae sunt similitudines, qui reguntur providentia Dei, qui continuationem seriemque rerum ad eam causam moderatur ac flectit, quam sibi in procreatione generis humani praestituit. Christianis in prisca Ecclesiae adolescentis aetate probro datum accepimus, quod maxima pars stipe precaria aut opere faciendo victitarent. Sed destituti ab opibus potentiaque, pervicere, tamen ut gratiam sibi locupletium, ac patrocinium potentium adjungerent. Cernere licebat impigros, laboriosos, pacificos, justitiae maximeque caritatis in exemplum retinentes. Ad ejusmodi vitae morumque spectaculum, evanuit omnis praejudicata opinio, obtrectatio obmutuit malevolorum, atque inveteratae superstitionis commenta veritati christianae paullatim cessere. De statu opificum certatur in praesens : quae certatio ratione dirimatur an secus, plurimum interest reipublicae in utramque partem. Ratione autem facile dirimetur ab artificibus christianis, si societate conjuncti ac prudentibus auctoribus usi, viam inierint eandem quam patres ac maiores singulari cum salute et sua et publica tenuerunt. Etenim quantumvis magna in homine vis opinionum praejudicatarum cupiditatumque sit ; tamen nisi

sensum honesti prava voluntas obstupescerit, futura est benevolentia civium in eos sponte propensior, quos industrios ac modestos cognoverint, quos aequitatem lucro, religionem officii rebus omnibus constiterit antepone. Ex quo illud etiam consequetur commodi, quod spes et facultas sanitatis non minima suppeditabitur opificibus iis, qui vel omnino despecta fide christiana, vel alienis a professione moribus vivant. Isti quidem se plerumque intelligunt falsa spe simulataque rerum specie deceptos. Sentiunt enim, sese apud cupidos dominos valde inhumane tractari, nec fieri fere pluris quam quantum pariant operando lucri: quibus autem sodalitatibus implicati sunt, in iis pro caritate atque amore intestinas discordias existere, petulantis atque incredulae paupertatis perpetuas comites. Fracto animo, extenuato corpore, quam valde se multi vellent e servitute tam humili vindicare: nec tamen audent, seu quod hominum pudor, seu metus inopiae prohibeat. Jamvero his omnibus mirum quantum prodesse ad salutem collegia catholicorum possunt, si haesitantes ad sinum suum, expediendis difficultatibus, invitarint, si resipiscentes in fidem tutelamque suam acceperint.

Habetis, Venerabiles Fratres, quos et qua ratione elaborare in caussa perdifficili necesse sit. Accingendum ad suas cuique partes, et maturime quidem, ne tantae jam molis incommodum fiat insanabilius cunctatione medicinae. Adhibeant legum institutorumque providentiam, qui gerunt respublicas: sua meminerint officia locupletes et domini: enitantur ratione, quorum res agitur, proletarii: cumque religio, ut initio diximus, malum pellere funditus sola possit, illud reputent universi, in primis instaurari mores christianos oportere, sine quibus ea ipsa arma prudentiae, quae maxime putantur idonea, parum sunt ad salutem valitura. Ad Ecclesiam quod spectat, desiderari operam suam nullo tempore nulloque modo, sinet, tanto plus allatura adiumenti, quanto sibi major in agendo libertas contigerit: idque nominatim intelligant, quorum munus est saluti publicae consulere. Intendant omnes animi industriaeque vires ministri sacrorum: vobisque, Venerabiles Fratres, auctoritate praeecuntibus et exemplo, sumpta ex evangelio documenta vitae hominibus ex omni ordine inculcare ne desinant: omni qua possunt ope pro salute populorum contendant, potissimumque studeant et tueri in se, et excitare in aliis, summis juxta atque infimis, omnium dominam ac reginam virtutum, caritatem. Optata quippe salus expectanda praecipue est ex magna effusione caritatis: christianae

caritatis intelligimus, quae totius Evangelii compendiaria lex est, quaeque semetipsam pro aliorum commodis semper devovere parata, contra saeculi insolentiam atque immoderatum amorem sui certissima est homini antidotus: cujus virtutis partes ac lineamenta divina Paulus Apostolus iis verbis expressit; *Caritas patiens est, benigna est, non quaerit quae sua sunt: omnia suffert; omnia sustinet.*¹

Divinorum munerum auspicem ac benevolentiae Nostrae testem vobis, singulis, Venerabiles Fratres, et Clero populoque vestro apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XV Maii An. MDCCCXCI, Pontificatus Nostri Decimoquarto.

LEO PP. XIII,

Notices of Books.

TRIUMPHALIA CHRONOLOGICA MONASTERII SANCTAE CRUCIS
IN HIBERNIA.

DE CISTERCIENSIVM HIBERNORVM VIRIS ILLUSTRIBUS.
Edited with a Translation, Notes, and Illustrations, by
Rev. Denis Murphy, S.J., M.R.I.A.

THE work named above—a history of the celebrated monastery of Holy Cross, and of the Cistercian Order in Ireland, has just been published. The work is edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Notes, by Rev. Denis Murphy, S.J. Father Murphy has made for himself a name that is certain to live as a distinguished Irish historian and archæologist. His name on the title-page of a book is a guarantee that the work is well done, and is a valuable one. And at a time when non-Catholics, almost without number, are investigating the ancient ruins of our country, and studying our ancient manuscripts, in order to draw from them arguments against the ancient faith of our people, the work of scholars like Father Murphy deserves from

¹ Cor. xiii, 4, 7.

Catholics special commendation and encouragement. He is studying Irish archæology and history to find out and sustain the truth, and the work now before us gives him a new claim on the gratitude of Irish Catholics.

This work is a translation of a curious old Latin manuscript now in the possession of the Most Rev. Dr. Croke, Archbishop of Cashel. It was written by the Rev. Brother John Hartry, a Cistercian monk, a native of Waterford, in 1640. The first part of the MS. gives the history of Holy Cross, up to the time of its suppression. The second part gives the history of a number of illustrious Irish members of the Cistercian Order. In this second part will be found recorded the sufferings endured by so many of our countrymen in those "dark and evil days" when our holy religion was banned, and its professors done to death in the name of law in Ireland, and that for no other cause than their attachment to this ancient faith. The Latin original is given on one page, and Father Murphy's translation on the opposite page. He has also added some footnotes and appendices, which greatly enhance the value of the book.

In the Introduction, extending over eighty pages, Father Murphy gives a history of the rise and spread of the Cistercian Order in Ireland, and of the principal houses of the Order, dwelling on the great monastery of Holy Cross. He gives also a very interesting sketch of the celebrated relic of the True Cross, formerly kept at Holy Cross and now in the possession of the Ursuline nuns of Blackrock, Co. Cork. This Introduction is a very valuable addition to our ecclesiastical history. The work is beautifully illustrated. Indeed some of the plates are most elaborate works of art. The coloured title-page is especially interesting, and all the plates, down to the most minute details, are done at home, and are highly creditable to our Irish artists. The book is splendidly got up, resembling in its general appearance the volumes of the Irish Archæological Society. It is a mine of curious and interesting information, and, at the low price of 10s., it must secure, as it well deserves to secure, a very wide circle of readers. We sincerely congratulate Father Murphy on the signal service he has done to our ecclesiastical literature by the publication of this most curious and interesting book,

J. M.

LIFE OF FATHER JOHN CURTIS, OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

By the author of "Tyborne," &c. Revised by Father Edward Purbick, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THIS is a very tender and touching record of a very gentle and holy life. It is true, in the words of the biographer, that the life of Father Curtis was an "uneventful" one, in the ordinary acceptation of the term; but yet it was a life of more than usual activity, and was fruitful of great blessings to hundreds and hundreds of souls. Father Curtis lived through a lengthened period, and was a witness of many stirring changes in his prolonged career. He was born in 1794, and lived on, in the complete enjoyment of all his mental faculties till the close of the year 1885, having reached the truly patriarchal age of ninety-one years, seventy of which were passed in the illustrious Order of which he was so distinguished an ornament.

His priestly career was, as we have said, a singularly active one. He was chosen by his superiors for all the prominent positions in the houses and colleges in which he resided, and was for several years superior of the Order in this country. Few names were more familiar to the priests and nuns of Ireland than was that of this learned and zealous Jesuit. He was ever ready to give them the benefit of his great experience and solid judgment on many intricate points of the spiritual life, and many of the letters preserved in the little volume now before us, abound with comments and suggestions of the rarest beauty and value. His discourses at the retreats of the clergy throughout Ireland were always prized for their simplicity, their earnestness, and sound sense. "Father Curtis," says his biographer, "had never been what is understood by a good preacher. His delivery and voice were unsuited for pulpit oratory; but the matter of his sermons was always solid and beautiful, and many bore witness to the lasting effect his discourses had on them." It is a notable incident in his life that he conducted a week's retreat for the secular clergy of Dublin in Maynooth College, when he had attained his seventy-ninth year.

Notwithstanding the many calls upon his time and thoughts, Father Curtis was able to accomplish much literary work. He translated into English Father Cepari's *Life of St. Aloysius*, the French treatise of *Blessed Grignon de Montfort on Devotion to the Blessed Virgin*, and wrote some short but pithy biographies of

different Jesuit fathers. His book on the *Spiritual Exercises* is well known in these countries, and is replete with pious and practical suggestiveness. Our space will not allow a more detailed reference to this very interesting "Life." It is written without pretentiousness, and, perhaps, without sufficient regard to methodical arrangement; but it is none the less welcome as an affectionate tribute to the memory of a revered and saintly priest. Its publishers are Gill & Son, of Dublin.

J. D.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM.
Auctore P. Bengamen Elbel, O.S.F. Padertorn, A.D. 1891.

A NEW edition of the above-named excellent work is issuing from the press at Padertorn. The character of Elbel as a moral theologian stands deservedly high. His work was first published at Prague, in 1748. It has retained its popularity ever since, and the edition now appearing is a favourable indication of the esteem in which the work is still held. The work is arranged in "Conferences." Each conference opens with a clear, correct, and methodical explanation of the subject-matter. This is followed by a discussion of a number of practical cases illustrating the doctrine and principles laid down in the Conference. This arrangement renders the book a very useful one to priests who have not time to wade through extraneous matter when they are anxious to find the solution of a practical and, perhaps, pressing doubt. The new edition is to be in ten parts, five of which have already appeared. The type and paper are excellent, and in every sense the new edition is a most valuable book.

J. M.

LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA, S.J. Translated from the work of Father Virgilius Cepari, by a Priest of the same Society. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

WE welcome this new English edition of a valuable Italian work. It contains everything of interest found in the original work of Father Cepari, though it has been considerably abridged.

Father Cepari was an intimate friend of the angelic Saint Aloysius, and none had better opportunities of giving a graphic description of the saint, or of appreciating his great sanctity. The large circulation the work has met with in

Italy is the best proof of its value. This new English edition, carefully prepared by one of the fathers of the society, is published, neatly bound, at Messrs. Gill & Son, for one shilling. It will be a valuable acquisition for Catholic families, and we trust it will tend to spread devotion to a saint already held in such veneration on the Continent.

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGY. By Paul Schanz, D.D. Translated by the Rev. Michael F. Glancey and Rev. Victor J. Schobel, D.D. Dublin: 1891. Vol. II.

THE second volume of the great *Apology* of Dr. Schanz is just out. Like its predecessor, it reflects the highest credit upon its author, as well as on Father Glancey and Dr. Schobel, who has done so admirably the work of translation. This volume deals principally with the problems arising out of modern Biblical criticism, and it more than justifies the anticipations excited by the first volume. It goes over the whole range of difficulties raised against the Christian revelation by pseudo-science. In the opening chapters the history of revelation is traced both in its origin and all through those corrupted forms in which fragments of it were disguised up to the coming of our Lord. The relations of reason and revelation are traced in a special and most interesting chapter. Next come the criteria of revelation—miracles and prophecy—discussed in two chapters, in which the logical mind of the author, and his great store of knowledge, are conspicuously shown.

The chapters on the inspiration and trustworthiness of Scripture are perhaps the most interesting in the volume, and no one can read them without feeling how unfair was the unfriendly criticism passed on the first volume by some writers whose zeal seems to have gone beyond their knowledge. In the lucid statements of doctrines and facts given in this volume, difficulties are removed by anticipation, and the defender of revelation finds in it ready to hand arms wherewith to confront his foes. No priest in this day should be without some such book; and we have no hesitation in saying that this is the best of the kind we have seen.

J. M.

LIFE AND SCENERY IN MISSOURI. Reminiscences of a
Missionary Priest. Dublin: James Duffy & Co.

WE are violating no secret in mentioning that the author of this very entertaining little volume is the estimable and erudite pastor of Irishtown parish, Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, the well-known compiler of the *Lives of the Irish Saints*. Canon O'Hanlon spent his early life as a priest in the archdiocese of St. Louis, in Missouri State, and in the volume now before us he records the experiences and reminiscences of his active and zealous missionary career during those years. He has made the record extremely interesting, and conveys through it much novel and valuable information of the then condition, and the subsequent marvellous development, of the great city of St. Louis—in its religious, commercial, and political belongings. His descriptions of the scenic beauties of Missouri are very graphic and picturesque, and he shows a thorough familiarity with the ways and customs of the people.

The book has naturally much to say of the illustrious and singularly gifted prelate, the Most Rev. Dr. Kenrick, who has directed the spiritual affairs of St. Louis with such splendid success, and through so many years of trials and vicissitudes. The book will, on that account, be all the more welcome just now, inasmuch as the venerable prelate will have attained, during this year, his golden jubilee in the episcopacy, and will be receiving from the Catholics of America their affectionate tribute of congratulation and of love. The incident of his Grace's golden jubilee cannot fail to be of interest to Irishmen here at home, as his Grace is a native of the city of Dublin, and has always shown a deep concern for the welfare of the land of his birth. Canon O'Hanlon's recollections and impressions are full of interest, and bring the venerated and holy prelate vividly before the eyes of his readers. We cordially bespeak for *Life and Scenery in Missouri* a hearty welcome, and wish for it a large and a speedy success. D. J.

THE CHRISTIAN VIRGIN, IN HER FAMILY AND IN THE
WORLD: HER VIRTUES AND HER MISSION AT THE
PRESENT TIME. London: Burns & Oates.

THE author of this book has chosen to conceal her name, but it would appear that she is a lady of the world—young and unmarried—who has felt herself impelled to give to young

unmarried females like herself an instructive and edifying series of chapters on virginity in the world. As her work went onward, she submitted it to the judgment and correction of a learned and zealous priest, who watched its development with careful and assiduous vigilance. The work, when completed, was placed before the auxiliary Bishop of Lyons, and his Lordship has spoken of it in terms of unbounded praise and admiration. The idea of the book is a novel one, but it is excellently and practically carried out, and gives evidence of intelligence, earnestness, and practical piety. The main object of the work is conveyed in the question put by the writer in her "Dedication" of the work: "Does it not seem," she asks, "as if, at the present time, nothing would be more useful than the establishment of a secular association of virgins, who, loving God alone, making His glory their aim, and the salvation of souls their ambition, should live in the very midst of the world to give an example of virtue, and rouse all those with whom they are thrown to fervour? Might not such souls, as seed cast upon the earth, do much good among the families with whom they associate?" There is abundance of useful and charitable work marked out in this volume for such an association, and time would not hang heavily on the members' hands, if the programme laid down for observance were even partially carried out. There are passages of genuine eloquence and impressiveness throughout the volume, and the translation appears to have been carefully and skilfully rendered. Towards the close of the book there is a series of very fervent and devotional exercises. The book bears the *Nihil obstat* of Father Robinson, of the Oblates of St. Charles, and the *Imprimatur* of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. It is issued from the active presses of Burns & Oates, of London, and is excellently produced.

THE VEN. JEAN BAPTISTE VIANNEY, CURE D'ARS. By Kathleen O'Meara. London: 18, West-square, S.E.

THERE are few lives so replete with practical instruction for the zealous priest as that of the Venerable Curé d'Ars. His perfect humility and self-abnegation, his great sanctity, and the untiring charity with which he ministered to the spiritual and even temporal wants of all who sought his aid, won for him the heartfelt love and veneration of hundreds of thousands of people from all parts of France. The throngs of people from all parts that crowded to his confessional bore unmistakable testimony of

his wisdom as a spiritual director. His admirers were from all classes, rich and poor, learned and ignorant. The celebrated Dominican, Père Lacordaire, used to pride himself on the happy day that he spent with the venerable Curé, whom he always spoke of as "a saint." Archbishop Ullathorne said of him :—"The Curé d'Ars gave me a greater impression of sanctity than any man I ever met." Though in delicate health, he managed even in his old age to get through more work than usually falls to the lot of six priests. Taught in the school of suffering, both spiritual and temporal, he learned to pity the suffering of others ; and though there was nothing he hated so much as sin, he loved and lived for poor sinners.

The above life by Kathleen O'Meara gives a brief and concise account of his life, labours, and sufferings from his birth to his death. The name of the distinguished authoress is a sufficient comment on the style. It is only a hundred pages, yet contains a complete epitome of his life, and gives a great deal of instructive information. The interest is kept up all through. We can heartily recommend it to all, especially to those whose time may be so occupied as to prevent them entering on more lengthy biographies.

M. H.

HOW TO GET ON. By Rev. Bernard Feeney, Professor in Mount Angel Seminary and College, Oregon ; author of "Lessons from the Passion," "Home Duties," &c. With Preface by Most Rev. W. H. Grass, D.D., C.S.S.R., Archbishop of Oregon. New York: Benziger Brothers.

FATHER FEENEY has presented us in this volume with a really admirable and valuable work. It has received the authoritative *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Oregon, and has been honoured by his Grace with the special favour of a preface from his pen. The book, though, as might be expected, mainly intended for American Catholics, is well deserving of a wider extension, and will not fail to be a great influence for good wherever it finds its way. The archbishop in his preface, having alluded to some of the agencies at work throughout America for the undermining of Christian teaching and morality, proceeds thus :—"We, therefore, gladly welcome any and every work that may serve to counteract the dangerous influences abroad, and help to turn to great and noble purposes the splendid energy and determination so natural to the American character. We have not yet met any book which

seems to us so fitted for the purpose as the admirable work that has been kindly submitted to our criticism by the rev. author. We, therefore, gladly welcome this work of Rev. B. Feeney, entitled *How to Get On*. Its very title appeals strongly to that natural energy and strength of will so characteristic of the American people, and which, if properly directed, can achieve so much. Amidst the Babel of voices which so often mislead our youth to prostituting its fresh energy to improper ways and unbecoming purposes, this book of Rev. B. Feeney speaks the splendid words of truth. The author holds up to our people, and especially to our youth, the high goal which all can reach." After such a glowing commendation, from such a high and competent source, no words of ours are needed in praise of Father Feeney's book. It deserves all that his archbishop says of it. It is written throughout with vigour and sprightliness, and there is not a sentence which the least cultured reader cannot understand and appreciate. We need hardly add, that the clergy are perfectly safe in using every effort to promote its circulation.

THE BLIND APOSTLE AND HEROINE OF CHARITY. By Kathleen O'Meara. London: Burns & Oates.

KATHLEEN O'MEARA's third series of *Bells of the Sanctuary* has appeared in a neat volume of 280 pages, containing the lives of a saintly priest and one of those holy souls that may well be styled earth's angels of charity, with a short interesting preface by Cardinal Manning.

The *Blind Apostle*, Gaston De Sequer, belonged to a distinguished French family, and was born about seventy years ago. His school days at Fontenoy-aux-Roses do not seem to have foreshadowed his future sanctity, though his letters to his mother show him to have had a noble heart. Of those days he wrote :—"We were not impious in college, but we were utterly indifferent. When I think that the year after my first communion nobody suggested to us that we should make our Easter duty ! It took me fifteen years to get rid of the baneful effects of the impression left upon my mind by that fatal university." He was greatly attached to his grandmother, Countess Rostopchine ; and here we have the effect of good example brought into striking contrast with his university experiences, for it was to her saintly example during his holidays that he attributed his conversion. At eighteen he made a general confession, and gave himself

up to divine grace. In 1841 he was sent to Rome, Attaché to the Embassy, where he became a social favourite; but, contrary to all expectation, he developed a vocation for the priesthood. He was ordained in 1847, and celebrated his first mass at the high altar of St. Sulpice. In that mass he asked our Blessed Lady to obtain for him the infirmity that would be most crucifying to himself without hindering his ministry. That prayer was heard. Eleven years later he was a prelate in Rome, filling an important position as auditor of the Rota. He enjoyed the personal favour and friendship of the Pope and the Emperor. On the 1st of May he had just returned from a session of the Rota, when suddenly one of his eyes became stone blind. A year later, when taking a stroll with a brother, he suddenly exclaimed, "I am blind." He had lost his sight completely. He received his blindness as a divine vocation. This led to his renunciation of the high offices he held, and to his taking up the humbler yet more meritorious labours in Paris that earned for him the title of the Blind Apostle or the Blind Saint.

M. H.

LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA. Edited by Rev. J. F. O'Connor, S.J. New York.

THIS book (about 170 pages) is the joint production of sixteen students from the College of St. Francis Xavier, New York, all under the age of nineteen years. Though we cannot altogether endorse the rather superlative eulogies of the American press, considering the ages of the compilers, it is, no doubt, a success. The fact that it has already reached the eighth edition, and six thousand copies have been sold, is sufficient proof that the simplicity of its style and briefness of narration have not prevented it becoming a popular work. It is certainly more suited for the young than the more elaborate lives that we find in other languages. The language is simple, concise, and in some parts poetical.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

SEPTEMBER, 1891.

UNIVERSAL EXPECTATION OF THE VIRGIN AND THE MESSIAS: ITS ORIGIN AND PROGRESS.

WHEN God created our first parents He placed them in a delightful garden called Paradise. In that garden He planted "the tree of life"—a plant of heavenly origin, which had the property of repelling death, as the laurel, according to the ancients, repels lightning. To this mysterious tree was attached the immortality of the human race; afar from this protecting tree death recovered his prey, and man fell back from the height of heaven into his miserable coating of clay. Thus, in substance, speaks St. Augustine (*Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.*).

Man was never immortal in this world in the same way as the pure spirits, for a body formed from dust must naturally return to dust; he was so by a favour unexampled. This favour was granted conditionally, and exalted him and maintained him in a position very superior to his proper sphere. Immortality here below was never acquired by man by right of birth; every terrestrial body must perish by the dissolution of its parts, unless a special will of the Creator opposes this. Such divine will was manifested in favour of our first parents. Satan, however, attacked man in his strength, and Adam fell from the high position to which he had been exalted into the frightful abyss of disobedience and ingratitude.

No one, I imagine, will call in question that God acted upon His just right in banishing Adam from the earthly

paradise after his fall; but banishment involved the sentence of death upon man and his posterity; without the tree of life he was no longer anything better than a frail and perishable creature, subject to the laws which govern created bodies. When the antidote fails, it is plain that poison kills. Again become mortal, Adam begot children like himself: the children must follow the condition to which their father had fallen. In this God did the human race no wrong: we are mortal by our nature; He has left us such as we were. To withdraw a gratuitous favour, when the subject of such favour tears up with his own hands the deed which confers it upon him, is not cruelty; it is justice. The justice of God demanded a punishment proportioned to the offence, and there was no hope for the human race if a divine Being had not undertaken to satisfy for us all. Wherefore, almost simultaneously with the fall of our first parents in the garden of Eden, a mysterious prophecy, in which the goodness of the Creator was visible even amidst the vengeance of an offended God, came to revive their dejected minds. A daughter of Eve was destined to crush the head of the serpent, and regenerate for ever a guilty race: that woman was Mary. From that very instant a tradition became prevalent that a woman would come to repair the evil that woman had done. Even the great dispersion of the human race in the plains of Sennar failed to efface this belief from the minds of men, and they carried with them beyond the mountains and the seas this sweet but distant hope. Later on, when all the other ancient traditions were enveloped in clouds, that one of the Virgin and the Messiah resisted almost alone the action of time. And, indeed, if we but make a survey of the then known world, if we take a casual glance at the religious annals of nations, we shall find the promised virgin and her divine parturition to be the foundation of almost every theogony.

In Thibet, in Japan, and in part of the eastern peninsula of India, there is a tradition to the effect that the god Fo became incarnate in the womb of a young woman, in order to save mankind. As to the Chinese, we find that they reckon among the "sons of heaven" the emperor Hoang-Ti, whose

mother conceived him by the light of a flash of lightning. We find, too, in the Chi-king a beautiful ode on the marvellous birth of Heau-Tsi, the head of the dynasty of the Tcheons; and the paraphrase on this ode given by Ho-Sou, makes the resemblance to the divine parturition of Mary most striking. "Everyone at his birth," he says, "destroys the integrity of his mother, and causes her the most cruel sufferings. Kiang-Yuen brought forth her son without suffering, injury, or pain. This was because Tien (Heaven) would display its power, and show how much the Holy One differs from men. He was born without prejudice to his mother's virginity." The Lamas say that Buddha was born of the virgin Maha-Mahai. The Brahmins also tell us that when a god takes flesh, he is born in the womb of a virgin by divine operation. In the annals of the Macenicans, a tribe of people who dwell on the borders of Lake Zarayas in Paraguay, we read that at a very remote period a woman of rare beauty became a mother, still remaining a virgin; and, moreover, that her son, after working many miracles, raised himself in the air one day in presence of his astonished disciples, and transformed himself into a celestial luminary. We find a similar belief contained in the religious annals of several other nations; so much so, indeed, that if time and space permitted us to collect the scattered fragments of their various creeds, we would reconstruct, almost in detail, the history of the Virgin and the promised Messias.

It is certainly a matter of surprise that those legends, which are incontestably more ancient than the Gospel facts, should form, when connected together, the actual life of the Son of God. Can truth, therefore, spring from error? What are we to think of the striking analogy which exists between the Gospel facts, and the marvellous traditions of heathen nations? Are we to conclude with the self-styled philosophers of the school of Voltaire, or with the German visionaries of our own day, that the Apostles borrowed these fables from the various and poetic creeds of the East? But to say nothing of the jealous care with which the books reputed divine were guarded in those ancient times, how could poor men of the humblest class, whose whole and sole

knowledge was almost limited to steering a bark over the waters of the lake of Gennesareth, and whose nets were still dripping with its fresh waters, when promoted to the apostleship—how, I repeat, could such men find time or means of perusing the sacred volumes of the Hindoos, the Chinese, the Bactrians, the Phoenicians, and the Persians? How, therefore, are these analogies to be explained? We have not here a game of chance. These traditions evidently go back to the very infancy of the world. The antediluvian patriarchs seeking to form an idea of that woman whose miraculous maternity was to save the human race, pictured her to themselves under the features of Eve before her fall. They gave to her a sacred and majestic beauty, which would create in the souls of men a religious veneration. They made her a lovely star, whose rising was to precede the sun of justice. With this tradition of a pure virgin was connected the tradition of a saviour born of her womb, who was to immolate himself for the salvation of the human race.

The bloody sacrifice, too, which we find established from the most remote times among all nations and peoples, could have no other object than to preserve amongst men the remembrance of the sacrifice of Calvary, and thereby perpetuate faith and hope in a Redeemer to come. The worship, which Adam and Eve paid to God in Paradise, consisted, no doubt, of certain prayers and offerings of fruits and flowers. But when, ungrateful as they were, they had violated the precept of easy obedience, when they had lost with the immortalizing fruits of the tree of life their talisman against death, we find them offering to God the firstlings of their flocks. Here it may be asked: How came it into the mind of man that the Creator could be pleased with the violent death of His creature, and that an act of destruction could be an act of piety? Adam was, without doubt, endowed with the tenderest feelings of humanity. The immolation of animals—to his mind, at least—had not the smallest connection with vows and prayers; and consequently, when, as yet unskilled in killing, he stretched at his feet a poor creature, gentle and timid, he must have stood pale and dismayed like the assassin after his first murder! This thought, however,

came not from him; it was not an act of choice, but of painful obedience. Who imposed it? He alone to whom it belongs to dispose of life and death—God. Moved by the repentance of our first parents, God made known to them the mode of imploring His pardon. This manner of worship was none other than sacrifice, by which man, confessing that he had deserved death, substituted innocent victims in his stead, thereby recalling perpetually to his mind the great Victim of Calvary. The bloody sacrifice, therefore, was not a work of human invention, but reposed in reality upon a thought of the divine mercy, and perpetuated among all nations the tradition of the Messias.

But what were all these traditions of heathen nations, marvellous as they may appear, compared with that flood of light which illumined the elect children of God? If we turn to the oracles of the Old Testament relating to the Messias, we are struck with astonishment at the long chain of prophecy, the first link of which hangs on to the infancy of the world, while the last is fastened to the tomb of Christ. The threat of Jehovah to the infernal serpent includes the first of the oracles relating to the Messias, and it appears that Eve concluded from the words of the angel that she herself should be the mother of the promised Redeemer. The first of the race of Seth flattered themselves with the same hope. Noe, who was constituted heir of the faith, transmitted these revelations to Sem; and Sem, whose long life almost equalled those of his ancestors, might have repeated them to the father of the faithful. These traditions are succeeded in due course by the grand prophecy of Jacob. The dying patriarch having assembled his sons around his death-bed, announces to them that Juda has been chosen amongst all his brethren to be the father of that “Shiloh,” so often promised, who is to be the King of kings and the Lord of lords. He shall spring up, he says, from the ruins of his country, when the “Schebet” or sceptre (that is, legislative authority) shall have passed into the hands of a stranger. It is true, indeed, that some modern Jews strive to elude the force of this argument by translating “Schebet” and “Shiloh” differently from us. But their ancient books contradict them.

This prophecy is understood of the Messiah in the Talmud ; and Jonathan, to whom the Jews assign the first place among the disciples of Hillel, and whom they reverence almost as Moses, translates “ Schebet ” by principality, and “ Shiloh ” by Messiah.

Towards the end of the mission of Moses, and whilst the Israelites were still encamped in the desert, Balaam came in his turn, to confirm the promise of the Messiah, and to designate in the clearest manner the time of his coming. “ I shall see him, but not now,” he says ; “ I shall behold him, but not near.” The soothsayer, from the banks of the Euphrates, standing upon the rocky summits of Phogor, moved by the Spirit of God, beholds, as “ with the eye of a dream,” a wonderful vision. He sees the ruin of that Judea, which is not to be in existence till long afterwards ; he follows with his eye the fall of the Roman eagle, seven hundred years before the birth of the sons of Ilia, and when the wild goats of Latium are browsing upon the shrubby declivities of the seven hills.

Ages now roll on without any other promises from Jehovah ; but the oracles relating to the Messiah are confided to tradition or deposited in the sacred law. In the meantime Israel is called upon to wage an incessant contest against the idolatrous nations which surround her ; but during her many and varied fortunes her people do not forget the coming of Christ ; and, in default of new revelations, their very life becomes prophetic. Nothing but the present incredulity of the Jews could equal in depth the faith of their ancestors. On the threshold of eternity they hailed from afar the hope of the Redeemer, as Moses hailed with a sigh “ that land of milk and honey ” which the Lord closed against him. From the time of David, and under the kings, his children, the thread of prophecy is joined again, and the mystery of the promised Messiah becomes clearer than before. David spoke of the virginal parturition of Mary. Solomon, too, delighted in tracing her image with sweet strokes of the pencil. He sees her rising up in the midst of the daughters of Juda, “ as a lily among the thorns,” and her beauty rivals in splendour the “ rising moon.” Finally, we have the great oracle of

Isaias. He declares to the house of David, that God will give an encouraging sign of the future condition of Judea—a future to be yet long and glorious. “A virgin shall conceive,” he says; “she shall bring forth a Son, and His name shall be called Emmanuel, that is, God with us.” This Child, miraculously given to the earth, shall be an offset from the stock of Jesse, a flower sprung from his root. He shall be called God, the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace. He shall stand for an ensign of people; Him the Gentiles shall beseech, and His sepulchre shall “be glorious.” This oracle has been the subject of a long dispute between the Jews and the Christians. The Rabbins contend that the word “Halma,” used by Isaias, signifies merely a young woman, and not a virgin, as the Septuagint translates it. But St. Jerome, who, without exception, was the greatest of commentators and most profoundly versed in the Hebrew tongue, pronounces, without fear of contradiction, that “Halma,” wherever the word occurs in the Sacred Scripture, signifies exclusively a virgin in all her innocence, and nowhere a married woman. Luther, too, who made so deplorable a use of really great learning, admits the same; and even Mohomet himself has borne testimony to the Virginity of the Mother of God.

The mystery of the Messiah was entirely unveiled to the prophets; some of them see Bethlehem rendered illustrious by His birth; others foretell His triumphant entry into Jerusalem. Nothing is wanting to the completion of the prophecies; Jacob has determined the coming of the “Shiloh” at that precise moment when the Jews shall cease to be governed by their own laws, which implies the ruin of a state; Balaam adds that this ruin shall be the work of a people come from Italy; and the satrap Daniel reckons up precisely the weeks which are to elapse to that time.

“All that happens in the world,” says a man of genius, “has its sign before it. When the sun is about to rise, the horizon is tinted with a thousand colours, and the east appears all on fire. When the tempest comes, a dull murmur is heard on the shore, and the waves are agitated as if by

themselves." The figures of the Old Testament are the signs which announce the rising of the Sun of Justice and of the Star of the Sea. "All these things happened to them in figure." God matures His counsels in the course of ages, for a thousand years are with Him as one day; but man is eager to obtain, for man endures but a short time. After an expectation of four thousand years, the time marked out by so many prophecies arrived at last; the shadows of the old law disappear, the figure gives way to the substance, and Mary arises in the horizon of Judea, like the star which is the harbinger of day.

PHILIP DUFFY, C.C.

MISSION OF OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY.

"**I**RELAND," says Archbishop Lynch, "has a divine mission." In this assurance we have our greatest consolation, when we come to consider the ever-flowing tide of emigration which has rolled away from our shores during the past three hundred years. In early ages, indeed, the children of St. Patrick illumined the dark regions of Northern Europe with the light of faith. Germany alone, we are told, honours no less than one hundred and fifty-six Irish saints. France, Belgium, Italy, Norway, and Iceland, have each a large proportion of Irish saints on their calendar.

But the Irish saints of later days, whose lot has been to plant the faith upon the banks of the Hudson, the Potomac, and the Savannah; to light up the holy fane along the Western prairies; to traverse the untrodden waste, and raise aloft the glorious standard of the cross among the snow-capped peaks of Oregon, far outnumber these.

The divine mission has been faithfully discharged. Ireland has given the best blood of her warm heart to fulfil that duty; and with its accomplishment, as the harbinger of

her reward, we behold the first gleam of hope breaking through the dark clouds, which have so long overshadowed the sunny valleys of her own fair land.

Whatever weight may be attached to the statement of Archbishop Lynch, certain it is, that but for Ireland, the Church would hold a poor place in the great Republic. Nor can it be denied that it was the children of Erin erected the majestic cathedrals of the New World, and filled them with devout worshippers. For from 1633, when Leonard Calvert sailed for Maryland with a small colony, most of whom were Irish, until the present day, Ireland has continued to contribute far out of her proportion to the growth of America. The Irish Registrar-General in his emigration statistics for 1888, states that since 1851, when the collection of these statistics first commenced, three million two hundred and seventy-six thousand emigrants have left Ireland; while the Board of Trade returns show that during the past nine months no fewer than fifty-seven thousand six hundred and ninety-seven persons emigrated from our shores. From other sources, however, we find that, at the time these statistics were first taken, the Church had already grown to large proportions in the States. Six archbishops, thirty-three bishops, and eighteen hundred priests looked after the spiritual wants of three million souls, of whom nearly all were Irish. For it was especially between 1840 and 1850 that the American Church received an astonishing increase in numbers. During that decade more than two hundred thousand Irish annually passed through the portals of the New World. From these figures, then, it would appear that, making allowance for deaths and losses from other causes, Ireland has given to America not less than eight millions of her children.

Yes, we must not forget to make allowance for losses, for be it remembered that the early progress of Catholicity in America was not along a path of roses. "We ought, if there were no loss," wrote Bishop England in 1836, "to have five millions of Catholics, and as we have less than one million and a-quarter, there must be a loss of three millions

and three-quarters at least, and the persons so lost are found amongst the various sects to the amount of thrice the number of the Catholic population of the whole country."

To what causes then may we attribute all this enormous loss :—

1. To the unholy persecution which drove Catholics from Ireland.

2. To the penal code of the colonies.

3. To the want of churches and schools.

4. And to the odium attached, in those days, among English-speaking people to the very name of Catholic.

That so many of our race have lost the faith, may seem unaccountable ; to some extent, indeed, notwithstanding the above reasons, this is the case. But when we consider, in the first place, the condition and circumstances of those who generally were compelled to fly from our shores, and, in the second place, the character of the people, and the nature of the land in which they found a home, it may tend to throw a little light upon the subject. The condition of our emigrants, for the most part, was such as was least calculated to assist them in their struggle for faith and fortune in a foreign land. They were poor ; it was poverty compelled them to go ; and the ruthless penal code prohibited their receiving the blessing of a good education. On the other hand, the Church was not before them in the States to cherish and sustain them. They were the pioneers of the Church, and in too many cases penetrated far beyond the limits of the civilization of their day, and, at their death in the far West, their children, who, perhaps had never seen a Catholic priest, became the easy prey of proselytism or unbelief.

There was yet another cause of loss. It arose from the perils and dangers that had to be encountered the moment our emigrants set foot on American soil. Friendless, homeless, illiterate, unprotected, they became, only too often, the victims of wily and unscrupulous monsters, who made a regular profession of alluring our innocent Irish girls to low and disreputable lodging-houses, and thence to ruin and disgrace.

To staunch the wounds from which the life-blood of the American Church was flowing; to preserve our emigrant girls from this awful fate; to throw the mantle of faith around them at the very gates of the West, the mission of our Lady of the Rosary was founded, January 1st, 1884. It was at a meeting of the Irish Catholic Colonization Society in Chicago, May, 1883, that the idea of having a priest permanently located at Castle Garden was first suggested, as up to that time there was no Catholic mission at the Garden. The proposal at once received the warm approval of Bishops Ireland, Spaulding, and Ryan; and on all sides it was admitted to be of the utmost importance to have a priest specially appointed to look after the wants of the emigrants, and take them under his special care. To this important duty Father Riordan was appointed by the late Cardinal M'Closkey, and took charge of the mission, January 1st, 1884. Few men were as well qualified as this kindly, generous-hearted priest to make the undertaking a success; his very look inspired confidence, and his every thought was directed to secure for "his poor emigrant girls" a suitable home. Had God been pleased to spare him a little longer, it cannot be doubted that his efforts would have been crowned with complete success. As it is, however, he has left in the Mission Home at Castle Garden an undying monument of his energy and zeal.

At his demise, December 15, 1887, the mission was placed under the charge of Father Hugh Kelly, who, following in the footsteps of its founder, laboured earnestly in the same good cause, till ill-health, to the regret of all the sincere friends of the mission, compelled him to resign, January 24, 1889. Father M. Callaghan, late Rector of the Church of the Assumption, Peekskill, was then appointed successor to Father Kelly, by his Grace, the Archbishop of New York. In him the mission has found a good priest, gifted with all those qualities of head and heart necessary to carry on the good work; and there can be little doubt that, under his careful management, the mission of our Lady of the Rosary will continue to bear good fruit.

The object of the mission, as set forth by its founder, Father Riordan, was :—

“ 1. To establish at Castle Garden, the chief landing-place for emigrants, a Catholic bureau, under the charge of a priest, for the purpose of protecting, counselling, and supplying information to emigrants landing there

“ 2. A Catholic emigrants’ temporary home, or boarding-house, in which emigrants might be sheltered, safe from the dangers of the city, while waiting for employment or *in transitu*.

“ 3. To provide an emigrant’s chapel, by means of which the blessings and consolations of religion might be dispensed to those who make their first start in life in the New World under the auspices of the mission.”

This threefold object has now been accomplished, and the mission, under God, has been the means of guiding thousands of emigrant girls into the employment of Christian families. The beneficent influences of the mission have been experienced all over the country, and acknowledged with gratitude from every quarter. The amount of good done since its establishment can scarcely be estimated. Some idea, however, can be formed from the fact that, apart altogether from the vast numbers that have received advice and assistance, in many ways, on passing through to the interior of the country, no fewer than twenty-five thousand emigrant girls had up to August, 1890, been sheltered beneath its hospitable roof, shielded from the dangers which Father Riordan assures us “ it is impossible to exaggerate,” and placed in the bosom of good Catholic families, in which they are assured not only a comfortable home, but protection from the fearful fate that has, but too often, fallen to the lot of the hapless emigrant girl.

“ Ah! well the friendless girl can tell
 The arts the tempter knows,
 Who paints the path that leads to hell,
 But coloured like the rose.
 Oh! blessed be God’s eternal fame
 Who sent to such as me
 The mission of the blessed name—
 “ The Holy Rosary.”

There are few priests, who have any experience of

missionary work, but will admit that, in the case of individuals or families settling down in their district, a great deal of their future success depends on the influences that surround them, and the persons with whom they are first thrown into association. This truth is borne out, but in a far wider sense in the case of emigrants to the States. Place a Catholic emigrant in the bosom of a good virtuous family, until she becomes acclimatized and accustomed to the change of life, and the ways of the people around her, and you may be morally sure she will succeed. But place her in a low lodging-house in one of the slums of New York, where the very air is pestilential ; let her remain but a short time in companionship with the class which inhabits these parts, and the assimilation is so easy and so sure, that we have far too many examples to prove the rule.

Formerly, on landing at Castle Garden, the Irish emigrant girl had no friend to direct her course, a new world opened up before her, and she soon found out it had not the charms she once conjured up in her mind. She was, indeed, in America ; there was a time when she imagined if but there, success were assured ; but, alas ! she had now no idea whither to turn ; she was friendless and forlorn. Dangers surrounded her on every side, and, were she not fortunate enough to find employment at once, she was compelled to seek shelter in some low boarding-house, where debauchery and vice held high carnival. Now, all this is changed ; our emigrant girls are no longer friendless ; they are no longer without a home. The genial smile and gentle word of the priest cheers their drooping heart, and bids them welcome to the great Western World. The mission of our Lady of the Rosary throws open its hospitable doors to shield them from all peril, and offer them a secure refuge and haven of rest. Religion, with the sword of faith, stands sentinel on the watch-tower, and pours the balm of true consolation into their aching hearts.

The Church in America has taken active measures to safeguard our Irish emigrant girls ; but could not something be done at home, as well ? It is with the greatest deference

to the opinion of others, and a firm conviction that the matter is one of the utmost importance, that the writer ventures to offer a few suggestions. In doing so, indeed, he has waited patiently, expecting that some more facile pen than his might have advocated the cause of our poor emigrant girls. A great deal has undoubtedly been written from time to time on the subject, but more or less in a desultory kind of way, and having, as a consequence, little practical effect. After careful consideration of the question, added to several years' experience of a mission from which large numbers have been in the habit of leaving for America every week, he has come to the conclusion that until an auxiliary move is made in Ireland the work of the mission of our Lady of the Rosary cannot be as effective as it might. A great deal more could be done, and, in fact, ought to be done at home, since many of the dangers to which emigrant girls are exposed have to be encountered before ever they reach New York, and it is not without grave reason that they are cautioned against "ship acquaintances" in the little leaflets circulated by the mission.

When we consider that it is not unusual for four thousand emigrants to land in Castle Garden in one day, it will enable us to understand how utterly impossible it is for the priest in charge to pick out those who require special attention. This, indeed, would be comparatively easy did all our emigrant girls know of the existence of the Emigrant Home in Castle Garden. But how many of them leave Ireland without having heard of such an institution?

The first duty, then, for us at home would be to make emigrant girls aware of the fact that there exists at Castle Garden a Home, in care of a priest, where they will receive every attention and be secure from all danger. This is best accomplished by distributing the leaflets, which have been specially prepared to convey all necessary information to intending emigrants.

In the next place, could it not be so arranged, that, in conjunction with the Labour Bureau attached to the mission of our Lady of the Rosary, and in which all emigrants can find places, an office might be opened in some suitable part

of Ireland? Here, as in the Labour Bureau at Castle Garden, it would be possible for emigrant girls, before ever setting out from home, to secure a suitable situation, and be assured of falling into good hands. For the rules of the Bureau require that all those seeking female aid shall be supplied with letters, testifying to their character and social standing, from the Catholic priest of their district. In this office emigrants could obtain all necessary advice and information in reference to the mission of our Lady of the Rosary; leaflets could be distributed, and the names and destination, at least of all unprotected girls, taken down and forwarded to the rector of the mission, so that he might be on the look out for their arrival.

But many will say, Have not most of our emigrant girls friends to meet on the other side? The following extract from a letter received from Father Kelly tells its own tale:—

“There is another matter in which our people should be instructed—namely, self-reliance. Thousands of our young girls come here who have paid their own passage, but have no definite idea of what is best for them to do upon landing. All they seem to know is, that they are in America, and that they have an aunt, or a cousin, or a neighbour, residing somewhere in it, and if once with them they would be happy. God help them! That which is a commendable trait in their character at home sometimes leads to their ruin here—an open and affectionate heart.

“To make myself intelligible, I shall classify the people our emigrants generally have the address of:—

“First, sisters and brothers, aunts and uncles of character and means, and (rarely) convents and priests. Against such no objection can, of course, be made.

“Second, aunts, uncles, and cousins, who keep cheap boarding houses, or are comparatively poor, and who require the girl, not out of friendship or for her own sake, *but for her work*. This class I consider most objectionable.

“The third, and the most numerous, are relatives and friends whose character is of questionable repute. In this class I have been asked time and again to telegraph to acquaintances—young men whose character changed very much for the worse since their advent to America, and whose address would be some low ‘gin-mill’ in a not very respectable quarter of the city. Too many of our women, who are not all that we would wish them, can date their unhappiness, if not their misery, from the first few days

they spent in the society of such so-called friends; and well might they have exclaimed, 'From such friends, O Lord, deliver us!'"

There is yet, however, another point that claims our careful consideration. The object our poor girls have in view in leaving home is to improve their social position and secure a comfortable livelihood. Now, can they ever expect to attain this end, if, the moment they land in America, they begin to drink? And yet—

"It is a lamentable fact [Father Kelly assures us], that many—too many—of our young emigrant girls can be seen standing at the bar in the Rotunda, five minutes after landing, with a bottle of beer in their hands, usually with a cousin or neighbour boy. I fear [he continues] that curses, not loud but deep, follow some of these same cousins and neighbour boys. Thank God, they are not all alike; but those I have in my mind, as I write, not only do their utmost to prevent them from going to my Home (if obliged to stay over night), but use their influence to take them to cheap lodging-houses. Why is it that a single emigrant girl arrives here who is not pledged to abstain from all intoxicating liquors? They can have milk or coffee furnished them here instead of poison surely to their souls!"

This, then, is the greatest danger of all; and how is it to be avoided? There is only one remedy—total abstinence. Let the pledge be administered to all our emigrants, especially our emigrant girls, before ever they leave their native parish, and let them be directed to become members of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, which has branches in nearly every parish, as soon as ever they reach their destination. By this means thousands would be saved from taking the first downward step on the road to their eternal ruin, and the reproach which our countrymen have so often to bear would be for ever blotted out. It will not do to allow our emigrants to reach their new home before they take the pledge. No; the pledge should be administered by their own priest; and if so administered, will be regarded as a thousand times more sacred than if taken from the greatest advocate of the cause in the States. Moreover, grave dangers beset the emigrant on her journey, which can only be avoided by the adoption of this plan; for

sad, indeed, is the fate of the poor girl, however innocent she may be, who takes drink on an American Liner.

Had the mission of our Lady of the Rosary been established fifty years ago, how many souls would have been saved to the Church? Let the millions who have lost the faith and the countless dupes of wily procurators answer. If the mission, now that it is established, is not aided and assisted, how many souls will yet be lost to the faith, how many unsuspecting Irish girls brought to destruction? God only knows. The emigrant girls of to-day are little different in character from their predecessors; if there is a change at all, it is to be feared that it is only for the worse.

“Applying not a high but a moderate standard of morality [says Father Kelly] to some of the emigrants landed here during the past season, I fear that the enemy which through a long night of slavery and persecution we so successfully combated has at last gained a vantage point, which if a vigorous effort be not now made he will most assuredly hold.”

Are we to make that vigorous effort? Are we to throw ourselves into the work with a determination to succeed? If so there is no time to be lost. The spring will be upon us very soon again, and our ports of embarkation thronged with emigrant girls, only anxious to take advantage of every means which shall be put within their reach to save themselves from the perils of their journey. Forewarned is forearmed; let them then, by all means, be forewarned; let them be taught to avoid all dangerous companionship on board their vessel; to seek shelter and advice, if required, at the Mission Home; and to *rely not upon their friends, but upon themselves*. Let them be advised to take a place at once, which they can easily secure at the Labour Bureau, and write or call upon their friends after a time; and, above all, to avoid intoxicating drink, no matter on what plea it may be offered; and their safety is morally certain. For the bright Queen of Heaven, under whose patronage the mission has been placed, will smile down upon the poor emigrant girl, shield her from every danger, and lead her securely through the awful perils that beset her path.

JOHN NOLAN, C.C.

AN EARLY ENGLISH PRYMER.¹

CATHOLICS, in common with all cultured persons of literary tastes, ought to be, and are, specially indebted to those disinterested Protestants who devote thought, time, and money, to the revival of the Church's devotional treasures of the past. Such a labour of love may well be termed disinterested, for it seldom or never meets with its reward immediately, even if its reward comes eventually. In spite of such absence of encouragement, however, many are they who engage in this work of piety, whether in the combination of societies, or as units devoted to this division of sacred literature. And the last half century is conscious of many valuable results of such work, one of the latest of which is the volume edited by Mr. Littlehales, and published by the house of Longmans.

The main, if not the sole stipulation which Catholics mentally make, in order to arouse their sentiment of gratitude for such literary efforts on the part of Protestants, is twofold: the matter reproduced must be worthy, and the form in which the reproduction is made must be faithful and true. The prymer of the fourteenth century is a book of which both these features may be affirmed—the second absolutely, the first with qualifications. The MS. has been copied for the press, printed in clear, readable type, and collated afterwards with the original more than once, apparently with every possible care; and if any doubts are expressed, as they will be expressed, on the liturgical, as apart from the devotional, value of the MS. reprinted, these doubts have been felt and will be stated with much diffidence in their validity. Such a work demands from a critic the special knowledge of an expert (equal or even superior, to that of an editor), lacking which the latter could not have attempted the task he has achieved. Without pretending to take a position

¹ *The Prymer, or Prayer-Book of the Lay People in the Middle-Ages in English, dating about 1400, A.D. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, from the Manuscript (G. 24) in St. John's College, Cambridge, by Henry Littlehales. Part I.—Text.* London and New York: Longmans & Co., 1891.

higher than that of a student of some years' standing of printed primers, the writer at the outset finds himself, as any reviewer would find himself, placed at a disadvantage. In attempting to estimate the original of the reprint, and without the possibility of gaining access to the original, he is met with the absence of all information from Mr. Littlehales, upon which an intelligent criticism alone can be founded touching the value of the prymer. The volume in question contains the text only of an ancient prymer. It is innocent of any introduction, liturgical and explanatory; of any preface, saving a complimentary one; of footnote, or sidenote to the text; of a contemporary title, or page-heading of modern date; even of a table of contents, however brief, or of an index. Indeed, seldom has so helpless and bare a literary offspring been ushered into an unkind and exacting world, so free from every accidental aid for self-support, or incidental hint for the reader's guidance. In default of such help publicly afforded, and in view of an annotated Second Part promised in the future, the writer ventured to take an unusual course. Though personally unknown to the editor, an appeal was made to him for certain information, which presumably would, and for the perfection of his work necessarily must, be given hereafter. Such information would tend to avoid rash conclusions, or hasty generalisations which might legitimately be drawn from insufficient, if not from inexact, knowledge. The appeal was most courteously met and answered. And the following brief abstract may be considered a trustworthy, though informal apology for the work as it stands, the substance of which the editor will probably have no cause to repudiate hereafter. It may be well, however, in the first place, to indicate the opinion which was arrived at independently of Mr. Littlehales' obliging reply.

With some hesitation—but also with some confidence—the writer holds to an opinion that the prymer now published is—(1) an imperfect, (2) a faulty, and (3) a carelessly-written *replica* of a MS., which possibly, and even probably, (4) was, at its date of transcription, an unique specimen, representing only itself. This estimate of its singularity, with a full

consciousness of the almost endless variations in every part in the text of early prymers, can only, from a want of space, and on the present occasion, be stated as a mere opinion, and left undefended. Within the limits assigned to this short review, the other three points must be treated only in brief.

1. That the Prymer is a defective copy of whatsoever it represents, is obvious from the unsightly blank from page 42 to page 43, which, to the writer's literary taste, disfigures the reprint; and which, it may be added, might have been, and should have been, hypothetically filled, within cautionary brackets, with the reconstructed page in Appendix A. Nor is this the only imperfection in the way of omission which the editor of the MS. candidly acknowledges—notably in the absence of the common forms of prayer and instruction with which prymers are usually ended. Moreover, the prymer lacks many liturgical features, such as antiphons, V. and R's., prayers, and other devotions, which extant prymers, nearly or quite contemporary with the one under consideration, possess. For instance: the almost contemporary MS. edited by Mr. Maskell—whether or not in this respect it be typical—at the end of Lauds, and between the Collect to the Holy Trinity and the Prayer for Peace, includes collects, with Ant., Vers., and Resp., as follows:—On the Passion, to SS. Michael, John Baptist, Peter and Paul, Andrew, Lawrence, Nicholas, Margaret and Katherine, for the Holy Souls, and to all the Saints. These are absent from the MS. reprinted by Mr. Littlehales, and it is possible they may be exceptionally placed in Mr. Maskell's MS.

2. The MS. would seem to be faulty in many particulars, of which one may be named. The editor of it keeps in suspense his judgment on the contents of several pages, and other experts contend that the repetition of certain suffrages, &c., which only occur at the end of Lauds, and perhaps also of the other short Hours, do not recur at the end of Evensong, or Vespers, in MSS. of the first class, even though they may appear in printed copies at a later date. The editor, therefore, will be called upon, in his Second Part, to give his reasons for supporting the addition at the end of Evensong of the *suffragia*, which is justifiably

added at the end of Lauds, viz., the *Memoriae de Sancto Spirito, de Sancta Trinitate, de Omnibus Sanctis, de Pace*, and to afford evidence that these appear in the best MSS., or in printed copies of authority

3. The MS.—and this criticism is beyond contention—has been very carelessly copied, not by its modern editor, but by its middle-age scribe. The errors in manual execution are numerous, and inexcusable under any conditions. Apart from the variations always to be found in the spelling of Early English books—in this book more than ordinarily frequent—the mistakes of adding a letter, of omitting a letter, of misplacing a letter, of placing one letter for another, in the present MS., are of constant occurrence. For instance, *Anglicè*—to take but a few random instances—*ulessed*, for *blessed*; *wordl*, for *world*; *halve*, for *have*; *thee*, for *the*; *he*, for *the*; *leyl*, for *heyl*; *godis*, for *godes*; *hit*, for *it*; *his*, for *is*. The same word, also, is frequently met with, even in the same page, and frequently in various pages, differently spelled.

This judgment is expressed with diffidence, not only because of the qualifications of the reviewer, of which there may be doubt; but also, of the obscurity and difficulty of the many-sided topic reviewed, of which there can be no doubt. For it is certain that comparatively few persons, at the present day, are competent to offer a decided opinion on the *minutiae* of the contents and arrangements of Sarum prymers; whilst the data, upon which any person can form a trustworthy judgment in relation to these liturgical points, are rare and difficult of access. Indeed, it may be a question whether there be extant *authoritative* MS. prymers of the Sarum use, with which to compare Mr. Littlehales' reprint, and whether there ever existed an *authoritative* text in mediæval times at all comparable to the authorized text of the Roman Missal since its last reform. And it must ever be borne in mind that, in like manner, as textual critics of the New Testament do not always accept a MS. in virtue of its supposed early date alone, apart from other considerations, so it is with the early prymers. It is not always the most ancient prymer which is of the highest authority; a later MS. which

remains may have been copied from an earlier copy which has perished ; and the latter may be of higher value than the copy of another early MS. which has survived. Under such circumstances it behoves an editor to walk warily, and to decide with caution ; and it becomes a critic to write with modesty, and to condemn (if he is forced to condemn) with moderation. This will tend not only to friendliness in critical controversy, but also to the solution of liturgical problems, if editors and reviewers alike will agree to give and take, in knowledge and ignorance alike, in order that eventually both may reach a common goal—a course which both may legitimately take, seeing that the goal is not the revelation of dogmatic truth, but the exactitude of liturgical fact, detail, and history.

But, even if these criticisms, which are only specimens taken at haphazard, more of which might be added, and other similar objections, be well-founded, the book, in the opinion of the writer, from its date and rarity, from what can be proved of it and what can be intelligently imagined about it, is not unworthy—indeed is well worthy—of reproduction. In any case, and though a more perfect and valuable MS. might have been selected, it is a pure gain to Catholics to possess the reprint of an office-book, which may be typical, and which certainly was used by some pious forefather in the faith, nearly five centuries ago.

On the other hand, Mr. Littlehales, in the preface and notes to his Second Part, the issue of which may be expected in the coming year, 1892—and not, as he rather unguardedly says in his preface, in “ some few years ’ ” time—will be able to throw much light on the above and many other collateral topics which are now obscure. He will probably intimate that, although the MS. was neither quoted, nor utilized by that great liturgiologist, Mr. Maskell, he may have referred to it in the second edition of his *Monumenta Ritualia*. He will possibly contend that the book, which he has been at the pains of copying and at the cost of printing, represents a class which was in common use at its date of issue—represents it more closely than other and better-known prymers ; indeed, represents the form which

was most widely accepted in England during the Middle Ages. In spite of some evidence to the contrary, he will probably produce further evidence to show that the MS. is not only a fair specimen, but an exceedingly good specimen, both of its class and date—a point on which the editor presumably has wider possibilities of forming a correct judgment than most of his readers, and certainly than his critic. Whilst, if the prymer be wanting in some features that have been glanced at, in which MSS. of primary value, or authorized printed copies, are not deficient, it contains other features, such as the Kalendar and Easter-tables, in which even primers of the first rank are sometimes deficient. It will not be thought an unpardonable indiscretion, perhaps, on the part of the present writer, if he adds to this supposititious defence by the editor of the volume, that the much desiderated Second Part will probably contain, in parallel columns, the contents, in an abbreviated form, of six other primers—an addition which will greatly enhance the value of the work, and will prove a welcomed novelty in comparative liturgiology in the English language. It is much to be hoped that these six selected primers may prove to be not only representative specimens, but MSS. which have not yet been issued from the printing press. If Mr. Littlehales fulfils these hypothetical positions, he will make himself a double benefactor to the cause of Catholic literature. He will have regained for the Church not only an ancient MS. of great curiosity, but an ancient MS. of extreme value. Whilst the publication of his suggested Hexapla of Primers—taken in conjunction with the issue of a *catalogue raisonné*, now passing through the press, of all the English primers that are known to exist, which also, it may not be an indiscretion to mention, by the hand of another student of primers—will inaugurate a new era in relation to this department of the science of liturgiology.

Amongst other points which may be casually mentioned, as deserving of notice in this fourteenth-century MS., these which follow are noteworthy, though they be not all quoted as singular;—the form of its *Gloria Patri*, “Joy to the

Father," &c.; the graceful and poetical title of the Annunciation, as the "Greeting of our Lady;" the employment of the relative "that" for "who" in the Lord's Prayer, and "our Lord" for "the Lord" (though both forms are used) in the Ave, and elsewhere; the quaintness of some of its expressions, "Holy God's Mother," for "Holy Mother of God;" the rhythmical swing of some of the versions of the anthems of our Blessed Lady, which almost recall the poetic and rhythmical forms in common use; and the purity and beauty of some of the translations of the collects and some verses of the psalms—translations which here or elsewhere clearly inspired much of the language of the Anglican Psalter and Book of Common Prayer.

This similarity between the Protestant Prayer Book of the sixteenth century and a Catholic prymer of the fourteenth century, and the indebtedness which the former owes to the latter, leads by an easy train of thought to a criticism which the writer feels bound to make. In his short preface, Mr. Littlehales allows himself to couple together as similar factors in religion, and to place on one historical or critical level for purpose of comparison, "the Churches of England and Rome," and the office-books of either respectively. This apparent attempt to treat both communions as co-ordinate and co-equal spiritual bodies need not have, and has not, any controversial intention. Neither has the criticism of this attempt. But, from a liturgiological view only of the matter—and not from an historical, dogmatic,¹ or moral view—it surely is utterly uncritical to compare a Catholic office-book with a Protestant book of devotion; or an office replete and instinct with Catholic truth in word and act and intention, and a mere outward form and imitation of the same, in which the whole intention, *e.g.*, of sacrifice, is deliberately omitted; the whole action indicative of the supernatural in presence, person and power, is suppressed, and every word of the language with a dogmatic leaning to Catholicity is altered to suit the Protestant misbelief of the sixteenth century. For instance: what central point, or pervading truth, fact, or mystery, in the Office of Our Lady, or in the Office of the

Dead, which Mr. Littlehales names, or in that of the divine mystery of the Holy Mass which he does not name, can be found in the Common Prayer Book of the State-Established Religion? To attempt to compare such incomparable objects is to strive to make two lines meet which lie in different planes. Both are insoluble problems. Notwithstanding this liturgiological slip of the pen—may it be called even a solecism?—the mention of which he will pardon as inevitable in a Catholic review, by a Catholic reviewer, Mr. Littlehales must be, and is, heartily thanked for his sumptuous and comparatively inexpensive reproduction of this old English book of devotion to our Blessed Lady. He will not consider the gratitude expressed less warm if a final proposition be made, on behalf of the less learned reader whom he probably wishes to instruct, as well as to edify the more learned. The proposal amounts to this: to keep the present volume in print for the satisfaction of liturgical experts and students; but, together with the valuable and contemplated Hexapla, to add in a supplemental volume the present MS. in a form “understood of the people.” In other terms, to print this fourteenth-century prymer in the language and manner of the nineteenth century, with modernized spelling (without contractions), the grammar of the day, and the usual punctuation; together with a division of integral parts and verses; and also with the addition of the details alluded to at the outset of this notice as having been omitted—and, in the light of an effort to instruct the average reader, it may be said, as having been unhappily omitted.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

SOME RECOLLECTIONS OF FATHER PETER KENNEY, S.J., AS A PREACHER.¹

THOUGH nearly twenty years have passed away since I saw or heard Father Kenney, I have a very distinct recollection of him. The first trace of his luminous and powerful mind I saw was in some manuscript meditations which he composed during the short period of his holding the office of vice-president in this college (Nov., 1812, to Nov., 1813), copies of which were handed down through some of the college officials. It was in the second or third year of my course (I entered college in the end of August, 1829) that I was fortunate enough to obtain the loan of a copy of some of these meditations—how I now utterly forget. But I remember well that I was quite enchanted with them—they were so different from anything of the kind I had up to that time ever seen. I transcribed as many of them as I could—they were given to me only for a short period—into a blank paper book which I have still in my possession.

He conducted our September retreat some time towards the end of my college course. This was the first time I heard him. Subsequently I heard him several times when conducting the July retreat for priests in this college. The last time I ever heard him was in Gardiner-street, two or three years before his death, on the Feast of St Francis Xavier.

I have heard but few pulpit celebrities in my time, and therefore I do not fully convey my appreciation of Father Kenney's excellence in that line by merely saying that, according to my idea of the nature of true pulpit eloquence, he greatly surpassed the best of them. His eloquence was not only superior in degree; it was of a different order. I once heard the late Dr. Cahill, when he was at the zenith of

¹This essay was found among the papers of the late Very Rev. Dr. Murray, Professor of Theology in Maynooth College. It is noted in the manuscript, in the handwriting of Dr. Murray himself, that the paper was written some time between the close of the summer of 1868 and the summer of 1869.

his fame. It would be most unfair to judge of the general character of his eloquence from the specimen I then witnessed—for the subject was a hackneyed one, and therefore not well calculated to quicken the mental energy. Nothing could be more perfect than his delivery—in truth, it was somewhat too perfect; the sentiments simple and clear; no gaps and no redundancy; the whole went on in an easy and graceful flow, closing, too, at the proper time; that is, before any of the hearers began to wish for a close. It stole away the ear and the fancy like a fine piece of music. But it was more of a polished philosophical lecture than what I think a sermon addressed to an ordinary congregation should be. I am far from saying that St. Paul would have censured it; but I think he would not have overmuch admired it.

Father Kenney aimed not at the ear or the fancy, but, through the understanding, at the heart. Not to steal it; he seized it at once; and in his firm grasp held it beating quick in its rapt and willing captivity. In writing down these memories of him I try to revive and realize the past as faithfully as I can, and am not conscious of using the language of exaggeration; but it may be fair to say that I all along speak from the impressions of those young and perhaps too easily susceptible days.

The only other orator whom I ever thought of comparing him to was Daniel O'Connell. I recollect that, while both were yet living, I remarked, in a conversation with a very intelligent friend on Father Kenney's great powers, that he was the "O'Connell of the pulpit." My friend not only fully agreed with me, but expressed his surprise that the resemblance had never occurred to himself. The reason it did not occur to him was, no doubt, that ordinarily men do not think of searching for such comparisons out of the species, but set off pulpit orators against pulpit orators, as they set off bar orators against bar orators, and parliamentary against parliamentary.

Overwhelming strength and all-subduing pathos were the leading, as they were the common, characteristics of these two extraordinary men. I say nothing of clearness, preci-

sion, and those other conditions which must be found in all good composition, whether written or spoken, and especially in oratory addressed to the many, without which all seeming or so-called eloquence is mere hurdy-gurdy chattering. Also, I say nothing of O'Connell's inimitable and irresistible humour. There are, undoubtedly, certain occasions on which this talent may be exercised in the pulpit. But Father Kenney, if he possessed it, never in the least degree displayed it. I never saw a more serious countenance than his was on every occasion of my hearing him. Not solemn, not severe, but serious, and attractively and winningly so. There he stood—or sat, as the case might be—as if he had a special commission direct from heaven, on the due discharge of which might depend his own salvation and that of every soul present. Indeed so deeply did he seem to be penetrated with the importance of his sacred theme; so entirely did the persuasion of that importance display itself in his whole manner, that his discourses appeared to be the simple utterances of what his heart and soul had learned or digested in a long and absorbing meditation before the crucifix. That they often were, in fact, such utterances, I have no doubt whatever; one instance of this I once, by mere accident, happened to witness with my own eyes.

In another point he also strikingly resembled O'Connell. He never indulged in those poetic flights of fancy which delight only, or mainly, for their own sake. Imagination he, of course, had, and of a high order, too; otherwise he could never have been a true orator. But it was imagination subservient, not dominant; penetrating the main idea as a kindling spark of life, not glittering idly round about it; the woof interwoven with the warp, not the gaudy fringe dangling at the end of the texture. You will find none of these poetic flights to which I allude in Demosthenes or Cicero, in Chrysostom or Bourdaloue; and where they are found in modern orators of high name, they are blemishes not beauties. Of course, too, he had great felicity of diction, which is equally essential—using the very words and phrases which above all others exactly suited the thought, and set it off in its best light; so that the substitution of any words

would be at once felt as an injury, like the touch of an inferior artist covering the delicate lines of a master. This was all the more wonderful as I believe he received his higher education rather late in life, and was never very deep in English literature. But, as mere talent draws but little from a great heap, keeping that little as it was got, so true genius out of the scanty makes much, and out of the little great. What one man can construct out of ten lines, another man will require ten pages to find constructed there.

Real eloquence must be the offspring of genius, but of genius well cultivated and tutored. Of course I put aside the wonderful effects produced by the words of the saints—sermons, instructions, call them what you will—as in the case of the Curé of Ars in our own day. It was not what we call eloquence that did this ; it was not the preacher, but the saint ; it was not the sermon in itself or in its delivery ; it was, if I may so speak, the ardour of the Holy Ghost with which it came laden from the heart and the lips.

There have been saints whose very appearance in the pulpit, accompanied by a few broken sentences, melted every heart and moistened every eye. Saints do these things, and it is one of the ways in which God is wonderful in them. But men even of exalted piety, yet not saints in the higher sense of the word, must, to borrow the sentiment of St. Ignatius, cultivate their natural powers, and work as earnestly and assiduously in doing so as if success depended entirely on their own exertions—then calmly leaving the whole issue in the hands of God, as if all depended entirely on Him. To those who have any natural impediments to overcome, this sort of labour may be severe and protracted before its end be fully attained. But I should imagine that, in most truly great orators, the gifts that go to constitute the character are so abundantly supplied by nature, that the labour, at least after a short time, is but a labour of love.

However this may be, Father Kenney had, like O'Connell, attained that highest perfection of his art, which consists in so appearing, that no one dreams of any culture or art having been used—according to the well-known saying,

“*Summæ artis artem celare.*” So perfect was O’Connell in this respect, that, though I heard him often in the winter of 1837-38, and in the following years, it never once entered my mind to suspect that he had ever given any great attention to oratory as an art. His delivery always appeared to me spontaneous and unstudied, as are the movements and prattle of a child.

It was only after his death that I learned from some published memorials of him, and was at the time surprised to learn, that in early life he had taken great pains in forming his manner, and in particular that he had marked and studied with care the tones and modulations of voice for which the younger Pitt was so famous. Father Kenney, like O’Connell, used hardly any gesture. His voice was powerful, and at the same time pleasing; but I do not remember to have ever heard from him any of those soft, pathetic tones sometimes used by O’Connell, which winged his words to the heart, and the sound of which even at this distant period seems still to vibrate in my ears.

Father Kenney was eminently a theological preacher, and this too without the slightest tinge of that pedantry and affectation always so offensive to good taste, but peculiarly so in the pulpit. Indeed he was the only preacher I ever heard who possessed the marvellous power of fusing the hardest and most abstruse scholasticisms into forms that at once imparted to them clearness and simplicity, without in the least degree lessening their weight and dignity.

I give this characteristic of him partly from what I witnessed myself, and partly from what I heard from others. Many years ago I was told so by a very competent judge of a sermon of this kind, on the mystery of the Trinity, preached by him, I think, in Gardiner-street. A sermon which he preached in Belfast at the consecration of the late Archbishop Crolly as bishop of Down and Connor (1825) was one of his most successful efforts. It was on “*The Triumphs of the Church* ;” and so powerful was the impression made by it that for many years afterwards the substance of it used to be recounted by some who had not heard it themselves, but received the report from those who

had. I myself once heard one of these outlines from the lips of a friend, who was too young to be present on the occasion, or to comprehend the subject fully if he had been present.

I have never had any direct testimony given to me of Father Kenney's theological acquirements. But that he was a profound theologian I concluded, not so much from the theological character just mentioned of many of his sermons, as from other circumstances quite satisfactory to my mind, but too minute to be recorded here.

It was only in their declining years—within the last ten of their lives—that I heard either of these two great men, O'Connell and Father Kenney. If the Odyssey of the life of each shone with such brightness, what must have been the glowing splendour of its Iliad?

I am not aware that Father Kenney left any written memorials of his powers, except the few meditations alluded to in the beginning of this paper. I heard, I think from one of the Jesuit Fathers, about ten months before Father Kenney's death, that he rarely, if ever, wrote his sermons.

Allow me to add, as a not inappropriate pendant, the following extract from a letter of Lord Jeffrey, written in 1833; he was at the time member of Parliament for Edinburgh:—

"He (O'Connell) is a great artist. In my opinion, indisputably the greatest orator in the house: nervous, passionate, without art or ornament; concise, intrepid, terrible; far more in the style of old Demosthenic directness and vehemence than anything I have ever heard in this modern world; yet often coarse, and sometimes tiresome, as Demosthenes was too, though venturing far less, and going over far less ground."—(*Cockburn's Life of Jeffrey*, vol. i., p. 344.)

P. MURRAY.

SEN (OLD) PATRICK, WHO WAS HE?

IN some sciences it has passed into an axiom "that entities should not be multiplied without necessity," and it were well to apply the axiom to the domain of history. Nothing should be admitted for fact without fair evidence, especially if the proposed fact be far-reaching in its consequences or revolutionary of well-established views of history. Now, of such a character is the existence or identity of Sen Patrick. He is generally admitted to have been a contemporary of our national saint and his fellow-labourer on the Irish mission. But though Sen Patrick figures almost as prominently as our great St. Patrick in the opening chapters of Irish Church history, to our mind he is, as represented by most Patrician biographers, no better than a myth. The violence offered to the human system from the introduction of a foreign body is no less real than what is suffered from facts being grouped around a mythical personage: and if the identity of Sen Patrick has not been yet established, then indeed there has been an unnatural displacement of facts, and then at the very outset there has been initiated a slovenly and uncritical method of dealing with the evidences of history.

1. The Calendar of Cashel commemorates Patrick Senior under the 24th of August, and adds that while some said he was buried in Ros-dela, in the region of Magh-lacha, others, with more truth, state he was buried in Glastonbury, and that his relics are preserved in the shrine of Patrick Senior in Armagh.¹

2. The ancient Irish scholiast states that "our national apostle promised Patrick Senior that both of them would ascend together to heaven. Hence some say that the soul of St. Patrick awaited the death of Patrick Senior from the 17th of March to the end of August. Some state that Patrick Senior was buried in Ros-dela, while others, with more truth, state that he was buried in Glastonbury."²

¹ Here we see the reluctance to admit any person to be older than our national saint.

² *Tr. Thaumaturgas*, page 6.

3. The Calendar of Saints, written by Aengus the Culdee, while commemorating the saints under the 24th of August, states that "old Patrick was the champion of battle, and the lovable tutor to our sage." A glossarist of the fifteenth century adds that he was buried in Glastonbury.

4. The *Annals of the Four Masters* state, under the year 457, that old Patrick "breathed forth his soul." The *Annals of Ulster* make the same remark; but a copy of the *Annals of Connaught*, quoted by Ussher, states that he died in the year 453. The *Chronicon Scotorum* assigns his death to 454. The *Book of Lecan*, in its list of St. Patrick's household, gives old Patrick as "the head of all his wise seniors. Some ancient authorities suggest that the death of Patrick happened in the year 461 or 465,¹ from which it is inferred there was reference to old Patrick; for our Irish annalists assign generally the death of our national saint to the year 493.

5. I may remark that the sixth life of St. Patrick, written in the twelfth century, makes mention of a Patrick, nephew of our national saint, who on the death of his alleged uncle left Ireland, and was buried in Glastonbury. Later historians have called him Junior Patrick, in reference to his supposed uncle, our national apostle.²

6. While Irish annals and calendars recognise the existence of old Patrick, the primatial list of bishops ranks him amongst its metropolitans, and define the length of time during which he occupied the see. Let us glance at the first bishops of Armagh:—

The Psalter of Cashel gives—

Patritius.
Secundinus (sat.) vi. or xvi.
Patrick Senior, x. years.

Yellow Book of Lecan.

Patritius . . . xxii.
Sechnall . . . xiii.
Sen Patrick . . . x.

Book of Leinster gives—

Patrick, lxiiii. years from his coming to Erin till his death.
Sechnall, xiii.
Sen Patrick, ii.

¹ *Documenta de S. Patritio*, learnedly edited by Rev. E. Hogan, S.J., page 58.

² *Trias Thaum.*, page 106.

We have now noticed the principal events on which the theories about Sen Patrick have been grounded; but before reviewing these I may at once say that Sen Patrick, to my mind, is no other than Palladius, who preceded, about a year, our national apostle on the Irish mission.

7. Dr. Lanigan maintains that Sen Patrick was no other than our national saint, and that there was only one Patrick in the early Irish Church; but the *Book of Armagh* and other documents clearly establish that Palladius also was called Patrick,¹ and it is no less certain, notwithstanding the opposite opinion of Dr. Lanigan, that the term *Old* was applied to a Patrick, not for his absolute, but relative age. The opinion then of Dr. Lanigan is groundless.

8. The Bollandists suggest (vol. ii., March; vol. iv., Sep.) that a Patrick was called Sen, that is, Patrick Sen, as being the son of Sen, brother to our great saint. Nothing could be more unnatural than this view.² Every Irish writer has associated Sen Patrick with only one person, and made Sen only a qualitative adjective. The idea of a nephew having been with our apostle in Ireland till his death, cannot be entertained. The learned Bollandists, relying on the primatial list of bishops, state that Sen Patrick was successor to his uncle. The only objection raised by Dr. Todd against this statement is, that he was only coadjutor to the great St. Patrick. The *Confession* leads to the belief that our saint after entering on the Irish mission never after saw his country or relatives.

9. Another theory, advocated by Petrie and Dr. Moran,³ states that Sen Patrick came from Wales; that he co-operated with our national apostle in the conversion of Ireland; that at the close of his life he returned to Wales; and that a portion of his relics are in Armagh and Glastonbury. Dr. Moran added that Sen Patrick's "place is well defined in Celtic records." Why, the case is quite otherwise. The venerable *Speckled Book* gives him no place at all in the

¹ *Documenta*, &c., page 89.

² On the same wild system of genealogical derivation some improbable lives of St. Senan of Scattery made him successor to our national saint.

³ *Dublin Review*, April, 1880.

list of primates. And if we turn to the essays of Dr. Moran, we see that he there makes Sen Patrick not a Welshman, but an Irishman and a pagan, who in Glastonbury instructed our national saint, and in consequence was rewarded with the gift of faith. For these assertions there is not a tittle of evidence. Dr. Moran concludes the article in the *Dublin Review* by stating there were four Patricks in the first age of the Irish Church, each having a fixed place in history; but it is clear to my mind there was only one Patrick.

10. Nothing can be more unsettled than the position assigned to Sen Patrick by modern historians, because, as understood by them, he did not exist. They copied self-contradictory annalists. Now, the primatial succession starts either with the episcopate of our apostle or the foundation of Armagh: if with the former, the lists should include Palladius, Ireland's first bishop; if with the latter, how can Secundinus be included, as he is represented by Irish annalists to have sat during six, thirteen, or sixteen years, and to have died in the year 448, though the see was not founded till the year 455.¹ Moreover, the *Psalter of Cashel* makes Sen Patrick third in succession to the great St. Patrick, with Secundinus as intermediary (see sec. 6): the *Yellow Book of Lecan* does the same, with this difference, that it allows Secundinus to intervene between Sen Patrick and the great St. Patrick during thirteen years, rather six or sixteen, as stated by the Psalter; and the *Book of Leinster* allows only two years to the episcopate of Sen Patrick, while the other lists gave variously to it ten and thirteen years. The *Book of Leinster*, in grouping some remarkable events under several reigns, states that Secundinus and Sen Patrick died during the reign of King Laogaire, 428-463, but gives the death of "Patrick, bishop of the Irish" under the reign of Lugaid, 438-503; yet its list of bishops gives not a Patrick for many years after the death of Sen Patrick. In sober truth, the references to Sen Patrick in Irish annals were only an undigested reproduction of the baseless legends found in Norman chronicles.

¹ *Documenta*, &c., page 92.

The first mention of Sen Patrick in Irish annals does not appear earlier than the tenth century; but long before that time the monks of Glastonbury claimed the honour of his having been abbot of the monastery. The monastic chronicles state that St. Patrick after converting Ireland retired to Glastonbury in the year 433; or, according to others, 449; that he was sent in the year 425, in the sixty-third year of his age, to Ireland by Pope Celestine; that after spending eight years in Ireland he retired to Glastonbury, which he governed as abbot for thirty-nine years; and that he died in the year 472, in the one hundred and eleventh year of his age.¹ All these statements in reference to our national saint are discredited either by the *Book of Armagh* or the *Confession*. In point of fact, the connection of our saint after consecration with Glastonbury has no better foundation than either the vision of one monk, the dream of another, or some false document purporting to be written by St. Patrick himself. Even William of Malmesbury, who stood up for the *Antiquities of Glastonbury*, mentions with doubt the burial of St. Patrick there; but states that he was consecrated by Pope Celestine, and educated by Germanus of Auxerre.²

The consecration by Pope Celestine, mentioned by the Glastonbury writers could be attributed to Palladius, called for some time Patrick, but not to our national saint. The older Patrick is said to have been sent so early as the year 425, whereas our national saint did not come to Ireland till 432. He died in Saul, county Down, whereas Palladius died after landing in Wales and leaving Ireland, on his way to Rome. Glastonbury chronicles state that St. Patrick was a pupil of St. Germanus, and converted Ireland after labouring there several years; this was true of our national saint, but not of Palladius; for the *Book of Armagh* states that the Irish mission of Palladius was a failure; that his stay in Ireland was brief; that his death was immediately after landing in Wales, and that he patronized Germanus. The

¹ Ussher, *Primordia*, &c., pp. 125, 888, 893.

² *De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, lib. 2.

legendary chronicles state that Patrick left after him in Glastonbury an autobiographical notice, and that he was a Briton. Our national saint was, indeed, a Welsh Briton, and wrote his *Confession* not in Glastonbury, but in Ireland.

The *Annals of Connaught*, under the year 453, register the death of Old Patrick, bishop of Glastonbury. Furthermore, Ralph of Chester, writing of the Patrick who was said to have been buried in Glastonbury, states that he was commemorated on the 24th August as one who, finding the Irish people rebellious, turned his back on them, and retiring to Glastonbury, died there on the 24th of August.¹ Now, we must infer that the Patrick of Glastonbury was the Sen Patrick commemorated in Irish calendars on the 24th of August (see secs. 1, 2); and that Sen Patrick, mentioned in the *Polychronicon* of Ralph as having found the Irish rebellious, having abandoned them, and as having returned to Glastonbury, is no other than Palladius, is made evident by the *Book of Armagh*. For it states, in reference to the bad reception which the Irish gave to Palladius, as follows:—“Neither did these fierce and savage men receive his doctrine readily, nor did he himself wish to spend time in a land not his own, but he returned to him who sent him.”²

Here, then, we have Irish martyrologies and the *Book of Armagh* identifying the Patrick of the Saxon chronicles with Sen Patrick, or Palladius.

12. Lives of the Irish saints, compiled in the eleventh century, contain a notice of Sen Patrick, from which we may infer that he was no other than Palladius. The lives, full of anachronisms, state that Saints Dechan, Ailbe, Ibar, and Ciaran, were contemporaneous bishops in Ireland before St. Patrick, and that Palladius preceded him by many years. Palladius is represented as having baptized St. Ailbe on the confines of Munster and Leinster;³ and turning to the life of St. Alban, nephew of Bishop Ibar, we learn that the birth of

¹ *Polychronicon*, lib. 5, cap. 4.

² *Documenta*, &c., page 25.

³ *AA. SS. Hiberniæ*, ex Manuscripto Salman., Bollandistis, page 237, an. 1888.

the saint was foretold by Patrick, "chief father of Ireland;"⁵ and that while this Patrick was in the south of Leinster, St. Ibar, St. Alban, and Sen Patrick encountered a monster of the deep in Wexford bay. Now as this district is admitted to have been the scene of Palladius' labours, and as he and Sen Patrick are represented as contemporaries a long time before our national saint, we may infer that Sen Patrick was the Palladius mentioned in the life of St. Ailbe. The anachronisms that disfigure the lives have perplexed historians. Thus Declan, Ailbe, Ibar, and Ciaran, are falsely stated to have preceded our national saint; thus Palladius in the *Life of St. Ailbe*, is represented as contemporary with Conchobar M'Nessa in the first century; though, according to the *Book of Armagh*, he scarcely by a year preceded our national saint on the Irish mission, yet the Irish lives separate them by an interval of four hundred years; and though they make Sen Patrick contemporary with Palladius, and nominally distinct from him, they would have him succeed our national saint in the fifth century. Such anachronisms in uncritical biographies that were not collated with each other or the *Book of Armagh* are matter for regret; but it is matter for wonder that these anachronisms escaped the notice of the learned Bollandists. For Papebroke and Stilling (*AA. SS.* for March and September) suggest that what was said of St. Patrick in the life of St. Ailbe, *may* not refer to the great St. Patrick, but to Sen Patrick, his successor. But how *could* the great St. Patrick be referred to, as he lived four hundred years after the events commemorated in the life? The oversight of the Bollandists arose probably from not knowing that Palladius was called Patrick, and from not adverting that M'Nessa, the represented contemporary of Palladius, lived in the first century.

13. The inconsistent notices of Sen Patrick in the lives may be traced principally to the Glastonbury legends; and as the monks claimed St. Patrick as inmate and abbot after his supposed departure from the Irish mission, so Scottish writers claimed him as an apostolic missionary in Scotland.

¹ *Ibid.*, page 405.

The Glastonbury claims were advanced in the eight century. Irish chronicles of the tenth and eleventh centuries adopted the notices of Sen Patrick's death in the obits of Glastonbury, while the annals of Connaught and Ulster in the fifteenth century, and those of the Four Masters in the seventeenth were coloured by the Scottish theories. There was neither truth nor consistency in either Scottish or English legends. Some English legends stated that Old Patrick lived in Glastonbury for thirty-nine years, having come there in the year 433 ; while others made him come there in the year 449. The Scottish theories were no less inconsistent. Some maintained with Spotiswoode, that Palladius evangelized Scotland during twenty-three years, while others extended his labours there to thirty years. Hence we find, on the supposition that Palladius came to Ireland in the year 431, that the Irish chronicles variously date the death of Sen Patrick to the years 454, 459, and 461. The Scottish theories, stimulated probably by the earlier claims of Glastonbury, were mainly built on the statement of the very unreliable scholiast—that Palladius, having left Ireland, founded a church in Fordum.

The confusion in the Glastonbury legends differs from the Irish chronicles in this, that the former attribute the acts of the two Patricks to one person, while the latter preposterously make the first, or old Patrick, succeed the second Patrick. But even amid this obscurity gleams of truth flash out in the succession of bishops given in the *Book of Leinster* ; only two years are given to Sen Patrick or Palladius. He came to Ireland in 431, and died in 432. In course of time he was so much forgotten that the later notices of him in the *Book of Armagh* state that the place and nature of his death were unknown. Towards the close of the twelfth century it appears to have been nearly forgotten that Palladius was called Patrick for some centuries ; and in course of time our national saint so filled the public mind in connection with the conversion of Ireland, as to shut out the idea of any missionary previous to him.

But it may be objected that there is mention in the lives of several Patricks, a "source of much embarrassment" to our modern historians ; these are—(a) Sen Patrick, (b) Patrick

of Nola, (c) Patrick of Auvergne, (d) the three Patricks mentioned in the Tripartite, and (e) Patrick Junior. Patrick Senior (a), mentioned in the hymn of Fiacc, was Palladius; Patrick of Nola (b), commemorated by Farracius¹ on the Eve or first vespers of the 17th March, is no other than our national saint, who was ordained in Nola.² (c) The same may be said of Patrick of Auvergne, commemorated in the Roman martyrology on the 16th of March, to the great surprise of Baronius,³ as there had been no Patrick among the bishops of Clarmont: our national apostle had studied on the borders of Auvergne, and was there consecrated by the abbot-bishop Amatus. (d) The three other Patricks mentioned in the Tripartite,⁴ whom our saint met at Lerins, were probably Saints Honoratus, Maximus, and Hilary of Arles, three abbots there in succession.

(d) The three Patricks appear to be taken by the Tripartite as of consular rank; but such a meaning is misleading.⁵ If the Patricks (*laui Patricii*) were Christian names, then the writer was in error, as our apostle was not then called Patrick, unless by the figure prolepsis he anticipated the future name of the saint. The writer was also in error if he employed the *Patricius* as a name of honour; and it is most likely he did so employ it; for in page 123 (*Tr. Thaum.*) he states that our national saint received at consecration from Pope Celestine a name, *Patricius*, which at that time was expressive of honour and excellence. The mention of the three Patricks, then, was expressive of their patrician rank, and not of their Christian names.

(e) It is admitted that Palladius, an arch-deacon or deacon of the Roman Church, was sent by Pope Celestine to Ireland. He was called by the Irish the first Patrick. The Irish scholiast, in giving the relatives of our national saint (*Tr. Thaum.*, p. 4), states that Sannanus, the deacon, was his brother. He was his spiritual brother; for Sen, the deacon, mentioned by the scholiast was Sen Patrick, or Palladius.

¹ *Catal, SS. Italia.*

² *Vide I. E. RECORD, May, 1887.*
Note to Roman Martyrology.

⁴ Page 122.

⁵ *Tr. Thaum.*, page 123.

In turning from the scholiast of the tenth century to the sixth life by Joceline in the twelfth (*Tr. Thaum.*, p. 106), we are informed, that our national saint had a dear son Patrick (spiritually), who was son of San, and who, after the death of his uncle, returned to Britain, died there, and was buried in Glastonbury. Now, on this statement, Ussher remarks (*Primordia*, p. 823) that Sannanus, the deacon, was father to Patrick Junior; and Colgan winds up the story (*Appendix v.*, p. 225) by expressing a hope that he was born before San, his father, became a deacon. Here we see the Patricks almost inextricably involved, and the spiritual inconsistently confounded with carnal relationship. For Palladius, who has been properly described by Irish annalists as a "foster father or tutor" to our national saint, is made by-and-bye to sink to the level of a carnal brother, rises again to the higher spiritual level, but as a dependent or coadjutor to our apostle; and, having become a Patrick junior, nephew to the great Patrick, finally disappears in a grave at Glastonbury. And all this has been chronicled and faithfully copied as grave matter for history!

On broad historical lines, by a rather circuitous road, we have been led to the identification of Sen Patrick; but we might, through an easy and short cut, have arrived at the conclusion by a reference to the May number of the *I. E. RECORD*. It has been there proved clearly that only two persons were called Patrick, down to the eleventh century in the Irish Church. One of these was our national saint, the other was Palladius. Our national saint was always contradistinguished from Sen Patrick; not so with Palladius; and therefore, Palladius, as being the elder workman in the Irish vineyard, must have been he who, not inaptly, was called Sen Patrick.

SYLVESTER MALONE,

THE IRISH ABBEY IN YPRES.—III.

THE history of the Abbey of Our Lady of Grace has now been traced¹ from its foundation, in 1665, to the death, in 1723, of the second abbess of the Irish community who, it has been shown, might very fairly be spoken of as the real foundress of the house.

Abbess Butler's successor was Dame Xaveria Arthur, one of the first who had joined her after her return from Ireland. Dame Xaveria made her novitiate at Ghent, and at the end of it returned to Ypres for profession; but, as has already been related, this was delayed for a considerable period. She was, however, in time professed, in consequence of the interest shown in her by Mary of Modena. This was in 1700. Three years later she was named prioress, and remained so till her election to the abbacy, in 1723. She ruled the house for twenty years, and died in 1743, on the Feast of the Five Wounds—a feast which had been inserted by the Holy See in the conventual calendar at her own request.

Her successor was Dame Mary Magdalen Mandeville, who was blessed in the private chapel of the bishop's palace. When a novice Dame Mary Magdalen had occasion to visit Ireland, to resist the efforts made by her brother to deprive her of her property; and this was thought a good opportunity for recovering possession of the church plate which Abbess Butler had left in Ireland. Sister Mary Magdalen accordingly took charge of it, but the ship in which she embarked foundered off the Isle of Wight, and the plate was lost, she herself being only saved with difficulty. On her arrival at Ypres she recommenced her novitiate, and was professed in 1726. She died in 1760, seventeen years after her election as abbess.

The fifth Irish abbess was Dame Mary Bernard Dalton, who was chiefly remarkable for her devotion to the Sacred

¹ I. E. RECORD, February and May, 1891. The present, and concluding, article has been unavoidably delayed.

Heart, in honour of which, by permission of Pope Pius VI., she erected in the abbey church a confraternity which still flourishes. Abbess Dalton died in 1783.

Dame Clementine Mary Scholastica Lynch was chosen as her successor, though she was not yet thirty years old. After the proper dispensation had been granted she was blessed, went to the helm, and entered upon the duties of her office, which was to be the fruitful source of anxiety and care. In 1793 Belgium was overrun by one of the armies of revolutionary France. Ypres did not escape, and so early in the year as January 13th it was in the hands of the French. They demanded admittance into the Irish abbey, and were very naturally refused it by the abbess. They then broke into the house, and might have been very troublesome had they not drunk copiously. As it was they allowed themselves to be prevailed upon to pass the night in the out-parlours, and to permit the nuns to go to choir. The religious passed the night in fear and dread, but they were unmolested, and the morning brought help. One of the better disposed of the non-commissioned officers suggested that the abbess should apply to the general commanding at Tournay, as he, being an Irishman, would certainly come to her assistance. She was not slow to act upon this friendly advice, and her appeal for help was attended with complete success. The governor of Ypres called, apologized for what had been done, removed the seals which had been placed on various doors, paid for all damage, and withdrew the soldiers, though he took the opportunity of advising the nuns to avail themselves of the liberty to break their vows offered them by the republic.

The French were compelled to withdraw from Belgium in 1793; but in the following year they returned, and finally expelled the Austrians.¹ During this second struggle the abbey had a further experience of revolutionary courtesies; for when Ypres was taken a decree was published ordering the expulsion of the religious orders, and, though the Irish

¹ In the October of that year, 1794, Belgium was formally annexed to the French Republic, and the annexation was recognised by Austria in 1797 by the treaty of Campo Formio.

abbey received a respite on the ground of its members being foreigners, the nuns were incessantly worried by domiciliary visits. Matters drifted on for years, and before they were settled Abbess Lynch died. Her death took place on June 22nd, 1799; and shortly after the community elected as abbess her sister, Dame Bridget Mary Bernard Lynch.

Directly after her election the new abbess received notice of the final sentence of suppression. The revolutionary government sold the house, and ordered the nuns to leave it, taking nothing with them beyond what each one had in her cell. The allotted time expired on November 13th, the feast of All Benedictine Saints; but when this day arrived a violent storm prevented the nuns from leaving the abbey. Next day—All Monks Day—news came of a change of government. The new rulers permitted the nuns to remain in the abbey, and to buy back their own property from the men who had purchased it from the revolutionary robbers. After this they were no more disturbed; but owing to their inability to get money from England on account of the war, they were reduced to dire straits of poverty; one result of which was that for a whole year, not having a bedstead in the house, they were obliged to sleep on the floor. But regular discipline was not relaxed, nor had it been during the whole period of revolutionary troubles; and it is one of the proudest boasts of this community that, during the whole reign of terror they performed the divine office with an exactitude worthy of their order.

There is not much to add. The Irish abbey, which for long was the only convent in the Low Countries, went on quietly, though in extreme poverty. In 1830, Abbess Bridget Lynch, who had piloted her community through so many storms, died, and was succeeded by Dame Mary Benedict Byrne; and she was, in 1840, succeeded by Dame Elizabeth Jarrett.

In the early years of her rule Abbess Jarrett had the happiness to entertain as a guest the present Holy Father, then Monsignor Joachim Pecci, Archbishop of Damietta, and Nuncio Apostolic to the Court of Brussels, who blessed

a little chapel which stands in the corner of the garden. About the same time she experienced something of a less pleasant character, for by the failure of Wright's Bank the conventual resources were yet further crippled. But, in spite of this, by the generous assistance of Bishop Malou, of Bruges, and of Bishop Morris, O.S.B., the latter of whom had three sisters in the community, she was enabled to rebuild the house, replacing the old building by a fine specimen of Flemish Gothic, built of red brick with limestone dressings, and having the square cloisters, which are so essential a feature of real monastic architecture. The new building, however, contains more than one reminder of what has gone before, and not the least interesting of these mementoes are the refectory tables of Irish oak which were brought from her native land by Abbess Butler.¹ Having built her house, Abbess Jarrett made an endeavour to increase its revenues by applying to the English Treasury for the payment of the annuity which was granted to the Dublin house by James II. But the distinguished statesman who was then responsible for the finance of England replied that he could not recognise the claim, as James had already abdicated when he made the grant.

After nearly half a century of office, Abbess Jarrett died, and the community elected in her place their prioress, Dame Scholastica Bergé. The tenth abbess² of the Irish convent was blessed last year, on July 11th, the Solemn Commemoration of Saint Benedict, by the diocesan, Monsignor Faict,

¹ These tables are far from being the only objects of antiquarian interest belonging to the abbey. The lace worked by Mary Queen of Scots, and the colours taken at Ramillies, have already been mentioned; and, in addition to these things, some curtains and vestments made from some sixteenth-century brocade, given by one of the archduchesses, who is said to have worn it at a court ball, are worthy of notice.

² It will, perhaps, be convenient to collect here the names of the abesses. They run as follows:—[Dame Mary Beaumont of the English community, and then of the Irish]. 1. Dame Flavia Cary, 1682; 2. Dame Mary Joseph Butler, 1686; 3. Dame Margaret Xaveria Arthur, 1723; 4. Dame Mary Magdalen Mandeville, 1740; 5. Dame Mary Bernard Dalton, 1760; 6. Dame Mary Scholastica Lynch, 1783; 7. Dame Mary Bernard Lynch, 1799; 8. Dame Mary Benedict Byrne, 1830; 9. Dame Elizabeth Jarrett, 1840; 10. Dame Scholastica Bergé, 1890; *ad multos annos!*

bishop of Bruges,¹ who made use of the mitre and vestments which had been worked for him by the nuns of the Irish abbey, and also wore the pallium which had been sent him a year before as a special and remarkable proof of the Holy Father's affection and esteem. The venerable bishop was attended by a large number of the clergy, secular and regular, and by many friends of the house; and the Holy Father himself, remembering the visit he had paid the abbey at the time of his nunciature, took part in the proceedings by sending a telegram conveying his apostolic blessing.

The abbey is flourishing under the rule of its present abbess, and there has been quite a run of postulants. It is impossible to doubt that, if its existence and history were more widely known in the Island of Saints, Irish subjects would not be wanting for the only Irish Benedictine convent; a convent in which the memories of not a few Irish saints are venerated year by year.²

E. W. BECK, F.S.A. Scot.

¹ The See of Ypres was not restored after the Revolution.

² The feast of St. Patrick is kept as a double of the first class with an octave; that of St. Bridget, as a double of the second class; those of SS. Fursey, Frigidian, Columban, Kilian, Fiacre, and Colman, as greater doubles; and those of SS. Congall, Malachy, Winoc, and Dympna, as doubles. The last named, St. Dympna, is much honoured in Belgium, especially at Gheel, the head-quarters of the great lunatic colony, the church of which is not only dedicated in her honour, but contains her relics in a shrine, painted possibly by a contemporary of Memling. In connection with these Irish feasts two others may be mentioned—those of St. Milburga and St. Joseph of Arithmathæa, which were apparently taken from the old English Benedictine calendar.

THOUGHTS ON THE WISDOM OF GOD.

“God is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, neither is there any creature invisible in His sight; but all things are naked and open to His eyes.” (Hebrews iv. 12, 13.)

IF the immensity of the sidereal universe, and the prodigious scale of the visible creation reveals to us something of the infinite power of God, so, in like manner the perfect order observable throughout space and the beautiful harmony everywhere prevailing, and everywhere even conspicuous, speaks to us no less eloquently of His inscrutable wisdom. Every creature, from the greatest down to the least, bears testimony to the presence of an all-wise as well as of an all-powerful ruler. Whether, with the astronomer, we contemplate the intricate motions of the heavenly bodies, through the limitless realms of space, or whether, with the physician, we consider the motions of the tiny corpuscles in the blood, as they are carried along through every part of our wonderful body, to build up muscle, and bone, and tissue, we shall be equally struck by the most marked signs of a divine intelligence.

Consider for a moment the heavens above. Through its ample expanse unnumbered worlds are perpetually revolving. Herschel himself counted over twenty millions in the Milky Way alone. These worlds are not only innumerable, but they are thousands of times, and in the case of many, hundreds of thousand, and even millions of times, vaster than our entire earth. Yet they are perpetually rushing through space at a terrific rapidity. Each has its appointed path through the heavens; each dashes by at a lightning-like speed along the orbit marked out for it. While generations of men come and go, while nations rise and fall, these colossal worlds are ever hastening on their way, some at the rate of one thousand miles a minute, some at the rate of ten thousand miles, and even much more. Yet, observe, they never collide, never break away from their prescribed limits, never swerve to right or left, but follow their proper orbit

with such regularity and such precision and accuracy, that astronomers are able to predict to a nicety, to within a line, or even a fraction of a line, the spot in the heavens where they will be found fifty or a hundred years to come.

What an exhibition of divine wisdom is here! Truly does the Psalmist remind us that "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the works of His hands." (Ps. xviii.) But if we descend to earth, and contemplate the smallest object reposing upon its surface, the same truth is equally evident. The smallest wild-flower that grows in the hedgerows is equally loud and clear in its testimony to ears that are open to hear. Even the wild rose or the timorous violet comes before us as a perfect work of art, the produce of wisdom as well as of power. Nothing but infinite wisdom could impress upon a dull particle of unconscious matter—such as is the seed of a flower—those marvellous principles of force and hidden virtue, which enable it to build up and construct such beauteous forms from the elements of earth, air, and water; and to paint them with such fairy hues, to gild their petals with the gleam of burnished gold, and to fill their chalice cups with a sweetness and a fragrance that scents every passing breeze. Indeed, there is nothing throughout nature that does not whisper to us of God's intelligence and wisdom. As every shell murmurs of the great sea from which it came, so every creature murmurs of the Creator who fashioned and formed it.

In our own soul, however, we possess a more irresistible proof of God's wisdom. Our soul is intelligent, and possesses reason and the gift of judgment. Now, as no one can give what he does not possess, God could not create intelligence unless He first possessed it in an infinite degree. The royal prophet, arguing against those who would deny the personality of God, asks very pertinently:—"He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? And He that formed the eye, shall He not consider?" (Ps. xciii. 9.) So, in a similar temper, may we inquire:—He that has bestowed intelligence, shall He not understand? and He that has created reason, shall He not comprehend? Evidently, if reason and intelligence

exist anywhere in creation that very fact proves incontestably that it exists in the mind of the infinite Creator.

The Holy Scriptures again and again proclaim the omniscience of God. In Ecclus. (xxiii. 28) we read : " The eyes of the Lord are far brighter than the sun ; beholding round about all the ways of men, and the bottom of the deep, and looking into the hearts of men, into the most hidden parts." So again, similar passages are to be met with in the Psalms ; *e.g.*, cxxxviii : " Thou hast known my sitting down, and my rising up ; Thou hast understood my thoughts afar off : my path and my line Thou hast searched out, and Thou hast foreseen all my ways." So in Ecclus. (xxxix. 24) : " The works of all flesh are before Him, and there is nothing hidden from His eyes. He seeth from eternity to eternity, and there is nothing wonderful before Him." Such quotations might be multiplied almost without limit.

Let us now enter a little more into particulars. Reason and faith teach us that the wisdom of God is infinite. If infinite it must have an infinite object. Such an object cannot, of course, be found among creatures which are essentially and necessarily limited. The only adequate object of God's knowledge and contemplation is God Himself. He knows Himself fully and exhaustively, and in a manner in which no creature knows or can know Him. Now observe : as every other being has sprung from Him, and is the fruit and result of His industry, it follows that in knowing Himself He knows all else besides. Let me attempt an illustration. Thus, if I could know an acorn perfectly : if I could measure all its vital forces, and gauge all its hidden sources of energy and growth, I should then be able to understand an oak-tree without ever having seen one. So, only in a transcendental manner, God by understanding Himself understands and knows all things else, all being but the effect of His power : for " all things," as St. John says, " were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made."

Perhaps we may realize this better by aid of a comparison. Take the example of a renowned painter. We steal softly into the studio of some famous artist : it is a

Raphael or a Rubens, or a Dominichino. We find him seated there, lost in reverie, his head leaning meditatively on his hand. He is awaiting the inspiration before he can commence his work. Around him lie his pigments, his brushes, his pallet and oils, and washes, and the untouched canvas. What is his purpose? He is about to paint an ideal figure or scene. That is to say, he is going to take the image existing in his own mind; and to transfer it to the canvas. The scene or figure must, therefore, be in his own mind, and lie clearly before him before he can give it an external and independent existence. It must exist in his own mind, before it is possible for it to exist in real colour and form. He must, in a word, grasp the image with his imagination ere he can give it any outward expression or external reality; *i.e.*, it must be known to the artist before the artist can, by aid of colour and form, make it known to others.

So is it, only in an infinitely higher degree, of the divine Artist, the Artist who has painted the heavens and beautified the earth. He must have known all things, even before He made them; for He could not create till He knew, and had already determined what it was He was about to create. It is absolutely necessary that the idea, the pattern, or prototype should exist within the mind of God before He could decree that it should have a real objective existence.

And here we may point out the fundamental distinction between the wisdom of man, such as it is, and the wisdom of God. With us, a thing must exist in order that we may know it; with God it is precisely the opposite. The thing must be known in order that it may exist. If it did not first exist, we could never know it; but if God did not first know it, it would never exist. In other words, our knowledge supposes the object already existing; on the other hand, the existence of any object supposes a preceding knowledge of it already in the mind of God. If any creature exists, then God must have known it before it existed, since otherwise it never could exist at all.

From this it follows that God's knowledge must be co-extensive with creation, *i.e.*, it must extend to every

existing creature, the greatest and the smallest alike; and even to every merely possible creature likewise; for unless known, they could not be properly described as even "possible."

Although *we* are unable to occupy our minds with many things at the same time, though a vast multitude of distinct objects breeds confusion with us, yet we must bear in mind, that this fact is owing simply to our finite nature. This confusion is not a necessary condition of the created mind inasmuch as it is *mind*: but it is a necessary condition of the created mind *inasmuch as it is finite and circumscribed*. It is a mere imperfection and limitation which in no way holds in respect to an infinite being.

God knows all truths without obscurity or confusion, and each individually as though no others existed—each as all, and all as each. What an overwhelming thought is this! Call to mind the myriads of creatures that swarm in the forests and fields, the seas and rivers, the earth and the air. Yet not a motion, not a sensation, not a breath or a throb, not the beat of a heart, not the glance of an eye, nor the tremor of a wing escapes Him. From the highest seraph in heaven down to the invisible amœba, whose world is a water drop, everything is "naked and open to His eyes." I stoop and dip my finger in a stagnant pool, and withdraw it with one small drop adhering to the tip. It is but a tiny drop. I place it beneath a powerful microscope. And behold! the drop is, as it were, transformed. It has grown into a veritable ocean—a world!—a universe! What seemed so clear, and still and void, is found to be teeming with life. Thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands, of strange and uncanny forms are plunging and swimming, and hurrying to and fro, and backwards and forwards, and up and down, in this little water world. There are pursuers and pursued, devourers and devoured; there are great and small, the strong and the weak; there are births and deaths, and thrills of joy, and throbs of pain, in that strange water world. Yet there is no birth and no death, no thrill of joy nor throb of pain even there—in that little universe glistening like a diamond at the end of my finger—but God knows it, and

permits it, and ordains it. For His providence watches over all, and without His foreknowledge nothing either stirs, breathes, or even exists, or can exist.

“Oh! the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God. How incomprehensible are His judgments, and how unsearchable His ways!” (Rom. xi. 33.) Yes! unfathomable, indeed, and unsearchable to the minds of men. That all, down to the invisible infusoria, should be clearly known to Him, and known individually, may seem strange. Yet it is an incontestable truth. We may easily convince ourselves of it by pointing out the absurdity of the opposite hypothesis.

Let us, then, suppose, for the sake of argument, that among the countless myriads of creatures one single individual exists of which God knows nothing. Observe the absurd consequences that would follow:—

1st. It would follow that God is not everywhere. For if He was everywhere He would be where that creature is, and would, of course, know it. To say, therefore, that there is any creature unknown to God, would be to deny His immensity and ubiquity.

2nd. It would follow that the dominion of God is not infinite. For if the creature we are referring to were dependent upon God, and supported each succeeding moment by the power of God, it must be known to Him. If it be not known, then it must be independent of God, self-existing, and its own master, which is absurd.

3rd. Indeed, to say that any being, however contemptible, is unknown to God, is the same thing as to deny His omniscience. His knowledge would not be infinite, because it might be added to: we could add the fact of this creature's existence.

What we have laid down in regard to every creature holds equally good of every portion and element of which even the least creature is made up.

But the thought of the wisdom of God, though well calculated to fill our minds with reverence and awe, becomes especially pertinent and practical when referred to ourselves in person. Indeed it is a great aid to sanctity and perfection

to try and realize God's intimate consciousness of all that goes on, even in our most secret heart of hearts. To feel God knows me intimately, clearly, fully, exhaustively. Heart and mind are naked and open before Him. I may forget Him; He cannot forget me. I may lose consciousness of Him in sleep; He cannot lose consciousness of me. My thoughts fly by so rapidly that they almost escape me; they cannot escape Him. God's all-penetrating eye follows me wheresoever I may be. Nothing could give God a clearer or a more thorough knowledge of me than He has already. Let me make an impossible supposition. Suppose God were to withdraw His attention from every other being so as to focus and concentrate it all on me alone. What, then? Well, He would even then know me no better than He does at present.

He knows me at this moment with absolute perfection and accuracy—my thoughts, my desires, my secret aspirations. Indeed, as compared with God, I am grossly ignorant of myself. I see, but cannot explain sight. I am ignorant of how I see. I feel, but sensation remains an insoluble mystery to me; and so of the other senses. Yet He knows who has designed and constructed all. But more: he knows me so intimately, that even my future is before Him as distinctly as my present. As He told St. Peter of his threefold sin of denial before he committed it—nay, when he declared and swore that he would rather suffer death than commit it—so could He tell every act and event of my future life—what I shall be thinking of, and doing, and desiring to do, each succeeding moment of my life; not in this world alone, but in the next world also, a thousand, a million, a billion centuries hence; yea, for all eternity. Not only will He know them as they occur, but He knows them now. He knew them an eternity before I was created!

This is not all. He is fully informed not only of what I shall do and think during the endless future that awaits me beyond the grave, but He is equally fully informed as to what I would do under every imaginable circumstance and under every possible hypothesis.

There are, of course, an infinite number of circumstances

in which I shall never really be placed, and millions upon millions of trials and temptations to which I shall never be subject; yet God knows exactly and accurately what I would do, and how I would conduct myself, were I so circumstanced, and were I so tried and tempted. And what, by way of example, I have said of myself, is true of each of the unnumbered host of angels and the countless generations of men, whether already created or yet to be created.

Nor does His knowledge end here. With equal perspicacity and exactness God knows not only every creature that now exists, or that one day will exist, but likewise the vastly larger number of merely possible creatures; *i.e.*, creatures which He might, but never will, create.

But we might go on for ever developing and extending the range of the infinite wisdom of God, in its incomprehensible grandeur and perfection. Let us rather employ the little space that remains in striving to draw some practical lessons.

The first effect of the consideration of God's wisdom is to enhance our reverence and esteem of Him, and to fill our minds with a deeper sense of His immensity, His majesty, and unapproachable excellence, and his infinite supremacy over all the works of His hands.

The second effect should be to produce in us a sense of the most profound humility, and perfect unquestioning submission to His authority, and a ready vivid faith in whatsoever He reveals: for what is the wisdom and knowledge of all men and angels combined compared to the wisdom and knowledge of God? As a grain of sand to a mountain; as a drop to the ocean; as the glow-worm's feeble spark to the mid-day splendour of the tropical sun.

A third effect is to fill the soul with a certain interior joy and gladness, peace, and tranquillity. These effects will arise from the thought of God's nearness. In the hour of trial, in the day of gloom and mourning, I will remember (and be comforted by the remembrance) that God knows my trials, my sorrows, and has weighed all my temptations and difficulties; that he is a witness both of my trials and sufferings, and of my patience and resignation under them.

I shall take comfort from the thought that I may address myself to Him at any time, and He will hear me ; that I may speak with Him familiarly and frankly by day or night "as a friend speaketh to a friend," without fear of being repulsed or misunderstood or chided.

The great misfortune, nowadays, is, that for so many men God has ceased to be a reality. Even those who believe in God's existence, do so only in an abstract and unreal manner. God does not enter into their very life ; the thought of Him is very seldom before them : they wholly fail to realize the awful presence of Omnipotence and Omniscience. Oh ! what a terrible awakening there will be some day.

Many marvellous surprises, no doubt, await us at the hour of our death ; but when we open our eyes for the first time in another world, will there be any surprise equal to that which we shall experience when we first learn how close and intimate God has been to us all our lives long ? Let us resolve to think more frequently of the all-seeing and all-penetrating eye of God, and the absolute perfection with which He reads our most secret thoughts, and we shall soon grow in holiness and sanctity. It is the method prescribed by God Himself : "Walk before Me, and be perfect."

J. S. VAUGHAN.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, THE PATRONESS OF ART.

IT is an oft-repeated boast of Protestant writers that the so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century were the champions of individual liberty not alone in religious belief, but even in the investigations of science and the development of art. They designate by the opprobrious name of the "dark ages" the centuries that elapsed between Charlemagne and Louis XII., because, say they, during that gloomy period the Catholic Church held the sciences in bondage, and kept men's minds in a state of ignorance for

her own sordid and selfish ends. But no sooner, they tell us, did men regain their birthright of individual liberty in thought and action than a remarkable change became at once perceptible in every department of knowledge. While the revolt of Luther against the authority of Rome restored freedom in the domain of religious speculation, the inductive philosophy of Bacon supplied a means of investigation hitherto unknown in the realms of science and art; and they point out the fruits of the new evangel, among other things, in the steamship and the telegraph, and the wonderful scientific discoveries which enable us to calculate the weight and distances of the planets, and to tell the constituent elements of the most remote of the fixed stars.

It would be interesting to investigate the grounds of such lofty pretensions in reference to the arts and sciences in detail; but as such an undertaking would be altogether out of proportion with the limits of a popular essay, we shall confine ourselves in the present paper to showing that as regards the Fine Arts, at least, Protestantism can make no such boast, but that they are mainly indebted for their advancement, if not for their origin, to the patronage bestowed on them by the Catholic Church. We purpose to show that it was within the Catholic Church that these Arts in their highest forms arose; that it was in the service of the Church they continued for many centuries to be employed; and that without the guiding, and, it may be, the restraining influence of the Church, the Fine Arts, as at present known, could not exist among men. Incidentally, as being intimately connected with the main subject, some of the principles of art criticism will be referred to, and the leading differences between the more prominent schools of art pointed out, as circumstances may seem to require.

Art, in its widest sense, means the power of doing something not taught by nature. But as this something may be very varied in its character and purpose, so must we distinguish several kinds of Art. The ancients divided the Arts into *liberal* and *servile*; the former embracing the seven branches of knowledge taught in their schools, and the latter imply-

ing the labours practised by their slaves. This division does not quite correspond with ours. We regard all Arts as classified under two great heads—the *industrial* and the *fine*; the object of the former being to minister to the common necessities of life; while that of the latter is, primarily at least, to give pleasure. It is in this sense, as having pleasure for their primary object, that we shall speak of the “Arts” throughout the remainder of our paper.

It is not all pleasure, however, that is the legitimate end of Art. There are certain pleasures provided at the dinner-table, for example, that no one would call artistic; nor do we regard the pleasurable satisfaction arising from the possession of wealth, or dignity, or power, as coming within the domain of æsthetics. The two great avenues of artistic pleasure are the eye and the ear, its sources being the sublime and beautiful in the external world. By means of the imagination, impressions made on the retina or tympanum are idealized, and thus it is that pleasure, originating in form, or colour, or sweet sounds, or plot-interest, may become artistic in the highest degree. The difference between æsthetic and non-æsthetic pleasure may be best illustrated by an example, which, though somewhat hackneyed from the variety of uses it is made to serve both in sacred and profane literature, yet admirably suits our purpose. We refer to the temptation of Eve. When our first mother, whose mind, then fair and innocent, was susceptible beyond expression of all the forms of beauty, looked upon the tree of knowledge, with its varied luxuriance of fruit and foliage, its harmonious blending of colours, its graceful symmetry of form, her eye drank in the surpassing beauty of the scene, which being distilled through the alembic of the imagination became transformed into an ocean of æsthetic pleasure in which her soul bathed with delight. It was only when—

“ Her rash hand in evil hour
“ Forth reaching to the fruit, she plucked and ate,”

that the sensual or non-æsthetic appetite was appeased, and

nature groaned to see her own beauty becoming the occasion of man's spiritual ruin :

“ Earth felt the wound, and Nature from her seat
Sighing through all her works, gave signs of woe
That all was lost.”

But if æsthetic pleasure has thus become the occasion of our fall, it may also be employed as an instrument of our resurrection. The winds of heaven that bear death upon their autumnal wings, and strip the giants of the forest of all their golden leafage, come to us in the early spring laden with freshness and beauty, to clothe the vegetable world with the robes of a new life. The sun, that from the height of its solstitial throne scorches earth's fair covering even to its roots, smiles upon it at other times and vivifies it into verdant luxuriance with the temperate warmth of his beams. And so it is with Art. The æsthetic pleasure that, under unfavourable circumstances, becomes the harbinger of spiritual death, may, in different contingencies, be made a potent factor in elevating the soul to the highest realms of a supernatural existence. This the Church has recognised ; and hence she avails herself of the Fine Arts, which have this pleasure for their object, as important auxiliaries in working out the salvation of men's souls. Her divine commission is to *teach* as well as to *preach*. The same voice that said : “ *Preach* the gospel to every creature,” also gave the command : “ Going, therefore, *teach* ye all nations.” Hence every means should be employed—appeals to the feelings no less than to the understanding ; addresses to our more tender and delicate susceptibilities no less than to our stronger and nobler instincts—in order to impart a knowledge of the truth, and to elevate human character to a higher spiritual level.

Now, refinement of feeling, a love of the beautiful, a hatred of all that is mean and gross and unlovely, are generally found allied with virtue. Moreover, to souls endowed with a tender susceptibility of the beautiful, appeals may be made through the feelings as well as, and not less effectively than, through the medium of the

understanding ; whereas persons not so favoured, present, as a rule, but one channel of communication, and that, perhaps, rarely open for the reception of spiritual truth. Hence it is that the Church, from the earliest ages, has made use of the Fine Arts, not only as a means of appealing to the understanding, but also, and principally, as aids in rendering the feelings available as avenues to the soul. The eye and ear she has made captive in a holy service ; and the arts that minister pleasure to these organs she has cultivated and encouraged for the greater glory of God and the edification of souls entrusted to her charge.

Setting aside, as not claiming attention in an essay such as this, the division of the Fine Arts known as the *fugitive*—under which are comprehended pantomime and elocution, dancing, and executive music—we pass on to investigate those of a permanent character ; namely, poetry, music, sculpture, painting, and architecture. We shall briefly examine how they influence the soul through the intellect and the feelings, and the extent to which they have been patronized by the Church at the successive stages of their development.

And first as to the sister arts, poetry and music. Both poetry and music have æsthetic pleasure for their primary end ; but while music addresses itself almost solely to the feelings, poetry appeals to the feelings and understanding alike. In both the imagination and fancy play a highly important part. The poet does not give us mere words, nor the musician merely black marks upon paper ; but behind the language in the one case and the notes in the other there dwells a spirit that conjures up images of beauty and sublimity to the mental vision ; and it is in the enjoyment of these images, of their individual symmetry and beauty, of their mutual interdependence, of the concatenation of ideas which they so involve as to communicate to the whole the character known as plot-interest, that the pleasures of imagination consist. And so intense may the enjoyment of these pleasures become to cultured minds that it often effectively restrains them from seeking after the gross and

debasing pleasures of sense. Of such minds Mark Akenside writes as follows :—

“ O blest of heaven ! whom not the languid joys
Of luxury the syren, nor the bribes
Of sordid wealth, nor all the gaudy spoils
Of pageant honour, can seduce to leave
Those ever-blooming sweets, which from ‘ nature
And from art’ fair Imagination culls
To charm the enlivened soul.”

The elements of music that contribute to produce these effects are mainly four : timbre, rhythm, melody, and harmony. Discrete sounds of themselves possess elements of beauty that are calculated to produce an exquisite sense of pleasure. Neither the sweetest carol of the thrush, nor the murmuring ripple of the streamlet, nor the melancholy sigh that breathes through the willow or the vine, contains a single element of rhythm or melody or harmony ; and yet we feel that they are all musical. Music, however, in its most artistic form, embraces, though not always to the same extent, the three other elements just mentioned : rhythm, which marks the time by regular beats or pulsations ; melody, by which is understood an agreeable succession of sounds ; and harmony, or the simultaneous blending of notes that possess a certain mathematical relation to one another. When these elements are combined in artistic proportions the influence of music on the soul can hardly be exaggerated. “ Music hath charms to soothe the savage breast.” It is a divine enchantress capable of compelling the malignant Caliban into submission, or of commanding the tricksty Ariel to execute its high behests :—

“ It comes o’er the ear like the sweet south
That breathes upon a bank of violets,
Stealing and giving odour”—

penetrating at one time the deepest recesses of despair, and rescuing the timid soul from gloomy melancholy, soaring at another to the loftiest heights of ecstatic joy, bearing us heavenward on its wings, and suggesting thoughts of bliss beyond the reaches of our souls. It comes to us, too,

“ Burdened with a grand majestic secret
That keeps sweeping from us evermore.”

as if telling us of something above us and beyond us only to be fully revealed in the life beyond the stars.

The peculiarly indefinite character of music, with its infinite possibility of suggesting noble thoughts and lofty aspirations, has led many to believe that it loses much of its powers when allied to poetry. But it has not been found so in fact. They have been sister arts from the beginning, and they shall be so to the end. Possibly it may be true that music—if we may borrow philosophical terms—loses much of its extension when tied down to set forms of speech; but, if so, it acquires a larger comprehension, a greater intensity and force. And few will be prepared to deny that it may be often well to sacrifice an uncertain good existing only potentially for the sake of gaining a certain and definite advantage. That a decided advantage may be gained is clear, because music and poetry combined appeal to the soul directly through the understanding as well as through the feelings; whereas music, as we have seen, addresses itself for the most part to the feelings alone. No, music by itself, or poetry by itself, can rarely lift the soul to the empyrean heights of celestial contemplation, and keep it there; but when both arts are united in loving embrace, and commune on some sacred subject, they suggest thoughts and feelings that create a distaste for the gross pleasures of earth, and lead the soul to fix its affections upon God alone.

Such being the capabilities of poetry and music, we are prepared to find that the Church encouraged their cultivation at every stage of her existence. Nor shall we be disappointed. There are few more interesting studies than the progress made by these arts under the patronage of the Church from the dawn of Christianity even until now.

And first, as regards poetry: it is no wonder that it should be so. If the incidents of the Trojan war supplied materials for the noblest epic that ever has been written; if sentiments of earthly love or ephemeral patriotism have inspired the most passionate lyrics that ever have found expression through the lips of man; if the fierce courage of Spartan heroes, or the treacherous cruelty of Athenian tyrants have been enshrined in immortal verse by the

dramatists of Greece; is it not natural to expect that poets should not be wanting to commemorate events of such mysterious and ineffable sublimity as the Incarnation, the Redemption, and the sanctification of the world? Hence poets were to be found in the apostolate of Christ. In the Apocalypse of St. John we find all the elements of sublime poetry: intensity of passion, beauty of description, brilliancy of imagination, play of fancy, and eloquence unsurpassed in its directness and force—all find expression in that wonderful book. Coming down a little further, and opening the Church's liturgy, we find the *Gloria*, and the *Preface*, and the *Te Deum*, and the beautiful *Exultet* of Holy Saturday—some of which are attributed to St. Augustine and others to St. Ambrose—all displaying an elevation of thought, a grace and dignity of expression, scarcely surpassed by the classic poets of ancient Greece or Rome. That St. Ambrose was endowed with a brilliant poetic genius, is manifest not only from the works just mentioned, but also from others. The hymns sung at Laudes in the office of a confessor pontiff, and the two hymns sung in the office of an apostle in paschal time—one beginning *Tristes erant Apostoli*, and the other *Paschale mundo gaudium*, are from his pen. Nor was our own country behindhand in contributing her quota to the poetry of the Church. Early in the fifth century a poet arose in Ireland named Coelius Sedulius; and so widespread became his fame both in the east and in the west, that he is known throughout the Church as the "Christian Virgil." Besides the well-known hymns *A Solis ortu cardine* and *Crudelis Herodes Deum*, he also wrote the celebrated epic known as the *Carmen Paschale*, to which Dr. Healy refers as follows in his *Ancient Schools and Scholars*:—

"The *Carmen Paschale* is divided into five books. The first treats of the creation and fall of man, as well as of the principal miracles recorded in the Old Testament; the second gives a beautiful account of the incarnation and birth of our Lord, and the wonders of the holy childhood; the third and fourth deal with the miracles and noteworthy events of our Saviour's public mission; while the fifth details the passion, death, and resurrection of Christ. Each of the books contains from three to four

hundred lines of heroic metre, in which the style and language of Virgil are as closely imitated as the nature of the subject will permit. The language is chaste, elegant, and harmonious, imparting dignity even to commonplace topics, as Virgil does in his *Georgics*. We would take the liberty of strongly recommending the careful perusal of this beautiful poem to priests who are anxious to read the great events of sacred history clothed in elegant language and adorned with becoming imagery."

And the epic of Sedulius was but the prelude of even loftier efforts by subsequent, though perhaps less famous, poets. With the rise of mysticism and scholasticism a new poetic spirit took possession of the cloister, firing the minds of its occupants with enthusiastic love, which enabled them to contemplate Christian mysteries in a light hitherto unknown. The result was such noble lyrics as the *Pange Lingua* and *Lauda Sion* of Aquinas, the *Dies Irae* of St. Thomas of Celano, and the *Stabat Mater* of the Franciscan Brother Jacobinus—all evincing a sublimity of thought and a tenderness of pathos unsurpassed in the whole range of literature. It was under the influence of the same spirit, which after a brief interval found its way into the world, that Dante wrote his *Divine Comedy*, which is universally admitted to be one of the noblest productions of human genius that have ever appeared. Centuries elapsed, but the spirit of poetry lived on, fostered by the Church; and so when the demon of revolt arose in the sixteenth century she found her Tasso, and her Lope de Vega, and her Calderon, to sing the mysteries of faith with an eloquence and sweetness all their own. Thus it was then, and thus it is to-day. If we open the Church's missal, we shall find poetry in its sequences; if we open the Church's breviary, we shall find poetry in its offices; if we open the writings of the Popes, from St. Peter the first, to the august pontiff who rules to-day with such austere dignity and brilliant intellectual power, we shall find poetry making up a considerable portion of the works they have produced. With this record before our minds, surely we may conclude with safety that, as regards poetry, at least, the Catholic Church deserves the title of Patroness of Art.

If poetry has thus been cultivated by the Church, it is unlikely that she could have allowed its sister Art, Music to lie

fallow and neglected. Indeed, so far was this from being the case, that music, as a Fine Art, remained for many centuries the exclusive property of the Church ; and whatever beauty or sublimity breathes through the musical compositions that charm the intellectual world of to-day may be traced either directly or indirectly to the influence of the Church.

That music has existed from the very infancy of the world as an accompaniment of religious worship, is clear from the history of the Jewish nation. Indeed, so important an element did it form in the religion of the people, that writers undertake to tell us the precise nature of the instruments used, of the modes employed, of the stops and cadences and intonations observed, in " the music of the Temple." That the Greeks had attained even a higher proficiency in the art, appears certain from many allusions to the fundamental principles of musical science in the works of Aristotle and Plato. They speak of purity of tone, rapidity of vibrations, and the mathematical relations of one sound to another. So much importance did they attach to relative distance as an essential element in the production of musical sound, that because the heavenly bodies are separated by certain distances from one another, they believed in the exploded doctrine of " the music of the spheres." We are prepared therefore to expect that at the dawn of Christianity some knowledge of music existed among both the Hebrews and the Greeks. Of its precise nature it is no longer possible to obtain definite information ; but that it existed in some form there appears to be no room for doubt. The evangelist hints that there was music at the Last Supper. St. Paul alludes more than once to the music of the Corinthians ; and the Fathers make frequent mention of the music that accompanied the *agapae*, or love-feasts of the primitive Church. It was not, however, until the time of St. Ambrose that ecclesiastical music began to make progress. He had travelled much in the East, and had become acquainted with the several systems existing there, and hence he was in a position, on being appointed to the important See of Milan, to provide for the Church a complete ritual both in words and music. He seems to have adopted the system prevailing among the Greeks as the

basis of his own, and to have distinguished the three elements—metre, rhythm, and melody. But whether this was so or not, so successful was the style of singing he introduced, so sublime its majesty, so tender its pathos, so sweet and affecting the beauty of its melody, that, as St. Augustine informs us, it often forced tears into the eyes of the audience.

Yet “his system,” as an ancient critic remarks, “bore within itself the seeds of its own death.” Pitched only in four modes, its total inadequacy for the expression of the varied thought and feeling embodied in the Christian liturgy soon became apparent, and suggested to many the necessity of further change. The remedy was not long delayed. Towards the close of the sixth century the great St. Gregory arose, and, in addition to other salutary reforms, he so improved the imperfect musical system of St. Ambrose as to accommodate it to all the needs of the Church. The change consisted in the substitution of eight different modes for the four hitherto existing, and in the combination under them of elements drawn partly from the Hebrew, partly from the Greek, and partly from other sources in the Church. Nor was this illustrious pontiff satisfied with merely giving to the Christian world a new musical system; he also took measures to secure its permanence and universality. He established at Rome a celebrated musical college, whither flocked ecclesiastics from every part of Christendom to learn the art of music from the great pontiff himself. And of the many bands of missionaries that he sent forth to preach the gospel to the nations, there was not one that had not its chanters and its choir master to surround the preaching of Christian truth with the embellishment of Christian music. Witness, among a host of similar examples, the arrival in Kent, in the year 596, of St. Augustine and his companions, bearing “the glad tidings of the gospel” to the people of Great Britain.

When St. Gregory had passed away his successors in the pontificate were scarcely less zealous in promoting the interests of the good cause. And they were ably seconded in their efforts by the secular authority throughout the

world. Never has there existed, for instance, a more enthusiastic patron of Gregorian music than the illustrious Charlemagne himself. Not only did he insist on his own children learning Gregorian chant, but he maintained a special Gregorian choir at court, and had schools of Gregorian music, presided over by Roman masters, established in several parts of his dominions. His first act on entering any important city was to march in military pomp to the cathedral, and there to insist on the local clergy singing some choice selections of Gregorian music for his special delectation. "And," say the old chroniclers, "little chance had the ecclesiastic of promotion to Church dignities who failed to sing his part to the satisfaction of the emperor."

But evil days were at hand. The Carlovingian dynasty passed away, and many of the successors of Hugh Capet, far from emulating the noble virtues of the illustrious Charlemagne, preferred rather to distinguish themselves by opposition to the Church and disregard for its ceremonial. Then the great Western schism began, and around the papal court at Avignon arose a band of singers whose compositions breathed rather the spirit of romantic love, celebrated by the Troubadours, than the grave solemnity that is becoming to the music of the Church. If Baini, the celebrated historian of the papal choir, is to be believed, ecclesiastical music, at this period, reached such a low ebb, that many councils—especially those of Treves and Vienna—were obliged to make solemn protest against several mischievous innovations then appearing in the Church. It was not, however, until the Council of Trent that the evil we have referred to was effectually checked. The question of ecclesiastical music was brought before the assembled prelates in the twenty-second and twenty-fourth sessions of that august body; and as a result it was decided that St. Charles Borromeo and Cardinal Vitellozzi should be appointed to devise a means for the reformation of ecclesiastical music. There was then in Rome, attached to the papal choir, a distinguished musician, Giovanni Pierluigi Palestrina, several of whose compositions—especially his *Impropria*—had

attracted considerable attention for their truly ecclesiastical spirit; and to him the two delegates of the Tridintine Council entrusted the task of writing suitable compositions for the offices of the Church. The result was the *Musica Pelestrinensis*, which, for solemn grandeur and sacred sublimity becoming to the word of God, had never been equalled before, and has never been equalled since.

But while Palestrina was yet living, the great religious upheaval of the sixteenth century was accomplished throughout Europe; and a secularizing spirit arose not only in religion, but in every other department of science and art; and after a time ecclesiastical music also, yielding to the influence of superior force, seemed to be sweeping towards the vortex where so much that had once been sacred and venerable was now swallowed up for ever. But the Catholic Church has proved no laggard. For the last three centuries more than ever has she set her face against degrading the sacred and solemn music of her ritual to the sensual level of the opera; and though she still finds much to admire in compositions that are not Gregorian—in the oratorios of Handel, and the fugues of Bach, and the sonatas of Beethoven—yet she ever keeps before us, as the loftiest ideal for ecclesiastical purposes, the sublime compositions that Palestrina has bequeathed to posterity. If we examine her policy, therefore, from the first ages of Christianity, we cannot fail to be convinced that in music as in poetry she is justified in claiming the title of “Patroness of Art.”

As the Church claims to be the patroness of poetry and music—arts which appeal to the ear—she is no less so of sculpture and painting, which address themselves to the eye. If the two former deserve cultivation, because of the manner in which they enhance the beauty and eloquence of her ceremonial, the two latter demand attention as auxiliaries in the ornamentation of the material edifice in which she worships. Nay, the latter would seem to merit even more attention than the former; for while the aim of music is often indefinite, and the language of poetry obscure,

sculpture and painting are always forcible and direct, speaking with unmistakable eloquence to the intellect and the heart. There are special reasons, therefore, why their study and cultivation should be patronized by the Church.

Painting is the poetry of light, and shape, and colour ; sculpture is the poetry of vital form. To be classed among the Fine Arts they must both appeal to the imagination. A mere photographer is not a painter, even though he uses colours ; a simple stone-cutter is not a sculptor, even though he succeeds in carving the rough outlines of a human figure. Painter and sculptor alike must be able not only to show us external features, but, moreover, to suggest a world of thought which the dry lineaments cannot reveal. Lord Macaulay tells us that the most striking characteristic of Milton's poetry is its suggestiveness. " Its effects are produced not so much by what it expresses as by what it suggests ; not so much by the ideas which it directly conveys, as by other ideas that are connected with them. He electrifies the mind through conductors." Thus, also, must it be with the sculptor and the painter. As the tiniest flower of the field became for St. Theresa a subject for meditation, so the simplest production of the artist must furnish abundant materials for a lengthened train of thought. This may be accomplished partly by the form, partly by the colouring, but principally by the expression of the figures introduced. We shall exemplify what we mean. It is an undoubted fact, that the Madonnas of Fra Angelico or of Fra Bartholomeo, have inspired a greater love of the angelic virtue than the most eloquent discourses that have ever been delivered on the immaculate purity of the Mother of God ; it is a truth which cannot be gainsaid, that the Bacchanalian pictures of Teniers have created more sots than the largest brewery in the Low Countries has ever succeeded in producing ; and all this because of the different trains of thought suggested by the paintings exposed to public view. Here we have examples of true Art, though, of course, with tendencies diametrically opposed. The picture may be in oil, in fresco, or in glass ; the statue may be in marble, in bronze, or in terra-cotta :

but if it fail to produce effects analogous to those referred to, it deserves not to be classed under the category of Art.

But if sculpture and painting possess this property in common, they have also some points of difference. They differ in their materials; they differ in their mode of working; they differ especially in their ideals. The materials of sculpture being hard, and the execution slow and difficult, the art, to be at all profitable, must aim at high ideals; otherwise the labourer would not be worthy of his hire. Hence its objects of imitation are the human figure, the nobler animals, or the more beautiful and symbolic specimens of the vegetable world. Painting, on the other hand, being comparatively easy when the art has been once acquired, may embrace an unlimited range of subjects. From an icicle to an iceberg, from a streamlet ripple to a sea storm, from a daisy in the field to a broad-armed sycamore in the forest, from a beggar boy in the street to the bright-winged cherubim upon their thrones—all may become legitimate subjects for the painter's brush. But there never yet has been an artist of the highest order who has not, under the influence of faith and noble sentiments, devoted the supreme efforts of his genius to the representation of supernatural subjects and the elucidation of divine truth; for these alone can furnish inspiration for the highest forms of Art. And it is well that it has been so; for the painter's brush and the sculptor's chisel can do almost as much for the advancement of truth and virtue as the sword of the Christian warrior, or the tongue of the Christian priest. Such being the case, it is no marvel that the Church has been an enthusiastic patroness of these arts from her first institution even until now.

It would be superfluous, in an essay on the Church's patronage of Art to attempt a disquisition on the relative merits of pagan and Christian sculpture at the time that each attained its highest excellence. Let it be sufficient to remark that nothing has been produced in Christian art—not even the "Baptism of Christ" by Leonardo da Vinci, nor the "Moses," of Michael Angelo—which can surpass, in grace of

form and expression of manly dignity, the statue of Apollo Belvidere in the Vatican Library:—

“The lord of the unerring bow,
The god of life and poesy and light—
The sun in human limbs arrayed,
All radiant from his triumph in the fight;
The shaft hath just been shot—the arrow bright
With an immortal’s vengeance; in his eye
And nostril beautiful disdain and might
And majesty flash their full lightnings by,
Developing in that one glance the Deity.”

Nor has Christian sculpture anything to show superior, as a study of human anatomy to that famous group in the Vatican, representing

“Laocoön’s torture dignifying pain—
A father’s love and mortal’s agony
With an immortal’s patience blending.”

In truth it must be admitted that of all the permanent Arts, sculpture has received least of the Church’s patronage and attention. The danger of idolatry in the early ages of Christianity, and the preference for nude figures at all subsequent periods, rendered the Church more chary than otherwise she might have been about extending an unlimited license to the exercise of sculpture. Yet we are by no means to infer that, when she found it suitable for religious purposes, she did not encourage it to its full. In the Catacombs are found numerous sculptured figures, for the most part symbolical representations of the chief mysteries of religion. They are generally carved on sarcophagi, and consist of the cross, the monogram of Christ, the lamb, the fish symbolizing the Saviour—the Greek *ΙΧΘΥΣ* being formed of the initial letters of the Redeemer’s name and title—and a number of others. They are not characterized by any superior artistic elegance, but, from the standpoint of the theologian, they are of the highest importance. They prove that the early Christians were firm believers in the doctrine of the real presence, of the sacrifice of the mass, of the cult of sacred images, and of many other dogmas of Catholic faith which Protestants would have us believe were innovations of a later date.

But artistic genius is naturally progressive. When Constantine embraced the Christian religion, and the Church came forth in triumph from the Catacombs, where she had been imprisoned for three centuries, as her Divine Master had arisen from the sepulchre where he had lain buried for three days, a greater freedom and power became at once perceptible in the productions of Christian Art. We begin to meet with sculptured representations of Christ and the Apostles, sometimes in marble, but generally in bronze or ivory, and displaying a higher artistic finish as years advance. Not until the Romanesque period, however, which embraces the tenth and eleventh centuries, did sculpture begin to be applied to altars, diptichs, and reliquaries. It was at this period that our own country excelled most others in Europe by its admirable designs in bronze and metal, many specimens of which are still preserved in the museum of the Royal Irish Academy. But something further was still necessary before sculpture could attain perfection. With the thirteenth century ended the Crusades, and the heroic warriors who had borne the cross in the East returned with their new ideas, infusing a spirit of enthusiastic faith and romantic bravery into the mind of Christendom. A change in the forms of Art was the natural consequence, and then we behold rising into mid-air magnificent Gothic structures, ornamented with numerous statues, in which power and dignity are blended in a manner hitherto unknown to Christian Art. Examine the western front of the cathedral at Rheims or at Cologne, and there you will behold the beauty of arrangement, the majesty of pose, the natural simplicity of drapery, and the individual characterization that bespeak the essential features of this interesting period.

But the Augustine age of Christian sculpture had not yet arrived. It remained for two distinguished pontiffs of the sixteenth century—Julius II. and Leo X.—to bring this art to its perfection. Convinced that the study of correct models is the surest road to success, in this, as in every other department of knowledge, these illustrious men spared neither trouble nor expense in their efforts to recover the classic statues that for centuries had lain buried beneath the

Tiber and Arno and in many other parts of Italy; and in a brief period the halls of the Vatican and the palace of the Medici became centres of artistic energy, whither students of Art repaired in crowds from every country in Europe. The result was that a galaxy of artistic genius appeared in Italy, with Leonardo da Vinci and Michael Angelo as its most brilliant lights; and immediately there began to come forth, from the lifeless marble of the quarry, majestic figures, bold in every feature, true to nature in every outline, apparently informed with a human soul that made them live and breathe. The tourist to Italy will pass from the "Medici Venus" in the Uffizi to examine the "David" in the National Gallery at Florence, will turn from "Apollo Belvidere" in the Vatican to study the statue of "Moses" in the Church of St. Peter ad Vincula, and will come away uncertain whether to award the palm of victory to Cleomenes of Athens or the unknown sculptor of the Apollo or the illustrious Michael Angelo, the king of Christian Art. But whatever be his decision, one thought, at least, must force itself upon his mind—that mankind owes a debt of infinite gratitude to the Catholic Church, whose patronage has either preserved or created these masterpieces, which shall serve as sources of inspiration until the end of time.

Christian painting arose simultaneously with Christian sculpture, and, because of its easier adaptability to religious uses, received a much more enthusiastic encouragement from the Church. The walls of the Catacombs still retain designs similar in character to those already referred to. There is a peculiar feature of these paintings that Protestant writers have misunderstood, and have, in consequence, charged the early Christians with ignorance of the Scriptures. I refer to what has been designated by some *compenetration*, or the co-existence in one picture of two or more scenes that either are incompatible, or else have no apparent connection with one another. For instance, Adam and Eve are represented in the act of yielding to the temptation, yet wearing the garments assumed subsequently to their fall; the Redeemer is sometimes depicted in the act of striking the rock, whence at the command of Moses flowed the

stream of water that followed the Israelites in the desert; the Blessed Virgin is shown as standing upon a mountain in an attitude of prayer, her uplifted arms sustained by St. Peter and St. Paul, while a battle rages in the distance; and other designs of a similar character. Now, it is manifest that these paintings, so far from substantiating the charge of ignorance against the early Christians, argue, on the contrary, rare powers of invention which discovered in the incidents of the Old Testament a hidden significance that was calculated to shed considerable light on the mysteries of Christianity.

The first remarkable change in the style of painting synchronizes with the transfer of the seat of empire to the East in the year 328; and for many centuries the peculiar features of the Byzantine school—a certain dryness and uniformity of execution, together with an unnatural leanness and elongation of the human figure—continued to prevail. The most interesting remains of this period are designs of manuscript illumination, which are preserved in the Vatican Library and in the public museums in the East. At the beginning of the eighth century there appeared many indications of the advent of broader views and of a higher artistic spirit; but just then arose the Iconoclasts, who, impelled by blind bigotry and unholy zeal, demolished every object of Christian Art that came within their reach. Stunned by this deadly blow the artistic spirit of the Church seemed to slumber for many centuries. In the meantime, no doubt, splendid work was being done, especially in our Irish monastic houses, in the department of manuscript illumination; but the muse of painting, in its highest sense, remained inactive, nor did she awaken from her slumber until roused into life and energy by the artists of Italy, at the beginning of the thirteenth century.

The pioneers of the revival were Guido of Sienna, Giunto of Pisa, and Cimabue of Florence. Their paintings exhibit a pious and majestic expression, and are invariably executed on a gold ground; but their figures still retain the defect of immoderate elongation, characteristic, as has been seen, of the old Byzantine school. Gradually, however, even these

shortcomings disappeared. Spurred on by a laudable spirit of emulation, the two rival schools of Florence and Sienna attempted the boldest flights into the highest regions of Art. Both drew their subjects from sacred history or ecclesiastical tradition; but while the Florentine school breathed a dramatic spirit, which found expression in a preponderance of action and energy and external nature, the school of Umbria was lyrical in its tone, and was marked by a sweetness and tenderness of expression and calm repose that bespeak the quietude and happiness of the soul within. The school of Florence soon outstripped its less aspiring rival, and the masterpieces of Giotto, Fra Angelico, Masaccio, Fra Bartolomeo, and Leonardo da Vinci, bear ample testimony to the success that crowned the efforts of its muse. Painting, however, like its sister art, did not reach its loftiest ideal in Italy until Michael Angelo and Raffael, warmly encouraged and generously subsidized by the two illustrious pontiffs already referred to, undertook the decoration of the Sistine chapel and of the halls of the Vatican.

In the year 1511, Michael Angelo commenced his work, and at the end of twenty months had completed those immortal frescoes which have become the envy and admiration of all subsequent artists. The different compartments in the ceiling of the chapel are occupied with subjects of ancient history; and from the walls appear to walk forth those seemingly solid figures which unfold graces of form and character beyond the limits of nature, and commensurate with the exalted functions in which they seem to be engaged. The "Last Judgment" above the altar is the masterpiece of this gifted genius; and, though obscured by age, and dimmed by carbonic deposits from the candles beneath, it remains to-day the most admired feature of the Sistine chapel, which is the artistic glory of the Church.

While Angelo was thus engaged, "the divine Raffael," as the Italians love to call him, was occupied in decorating the halls of the Vatican with those celebrated paintings, in which, as an able critic observes, "body and soul, sentiment and passion, the sensuous and the spiritual, receive each its

just degree of prominence." Among this celebrated group, "The Dispute on the Sacrament," "The Meeting of Leo and Atilla," and "The Mass of Bolsena," hold prominent positions. A peculiar feature of most of Raffael's pictures is that they contain portraits of some of his contemporaries, especially of his patrons and friends. Thus, in "Leo and Atilla," Leo X. is made to represent his illustrious namesake, and Atilla disappears to make room for Louis XII. of France. So, too, in the "Disputa," Bramante, the architect of St. Peter's, and an intimate friend of the artist, finds a place; while in the "Mass of Bolsena," Julius II. is represented kneeling before the altar, and gazing with an expression of wonderment upon the Bleeding Host. Thus has this illustrious artist transmitted to us not alone masterpieces of genius, but also faithful portraits of the most distinguished personages of his time.

Any notice of Raffael that should omit all reference to his *cartoons* would necessarily be imperfect; a few remarks must, therefore, be added on these celebrated pictures. Leo X., having decided to ornament some of the halls of the Vatican with Flanders tapestry, then the finest in Europe, desired Raffael to supply the designs from subjects of a Scriptural character suited to the purpose. The artist selected scenes from the Acts of the Apostles, and had the *cartoons* finished in a few weeks. The tapestry having been woven to the satisfaction of the pontiff, the *cartoons*, cut into strips by the weavers, who deemed them no longer valuable, were cast aside, and remained completely forgotten for upwards of a hundred years. Charles I. of England, who, though unfortunate as a ruler, yet had a cultured taste in Art, heard of them by accident, and secured them at a small sum for his Court in London. Owing to the political disturbances of the period, however, they were again suffered to remain neglected for more than half a century. It was only in the reign of William III. that their high artistic merit was recognised, and that they were fitted up to furnish one of the apartments in Hampton Court. At present, after being the wonder and admiration of more than two centuries of artists, they are the greatest object of attraction in the

art galleries at South Kensington. Thus has Protestant England been compelled to acknowledge the superior merit of this illustrious man, and to confess, if not expressly, at least by implication, that the Catholic Church, whose child he was, and to whose generous encouragement he owed his chief success, has been in painting, as we have seen she has been in other departments, a true Patroness of Art.

We have dealt at such great length with the first four branches of our subject that we should extend this paper to an unwarrantable length were we to enter on a detailed account of the various transitions of architecture. Indeed there is the less need for doing so as this is a department of Art with which most of our readers must be already more or less intimately acquainted. We shall, therefore, devote to its treatment a much briefer space than its relative importance would seem to demand.

During the first four centuries after the dawn of Christianity the Church was unable, because of her persecuted condition, to give architectural expression to the divine message entrusted to her. She found ample employment in defending her doctrines against the false principles of paganism, and preserving her children free from the defilements of a corrupt world. But no sooner had she escaped from bondage, and washed from her limbs the blood and dust that persecution had left upon them, than she determined to provide herself with temples worthy of her divine mission; and for this purpose she appropriated the basilicas, which had been hitherto employed in the service of paganism, and converted them to her own use. These were long, quadrangular buildings, divided into three or five aisles by means of pillars, and provided with a semicircular apse at one end. They were, therefore, admirably adapted to the service of the faithful; for, while immense congregations could be accommodated in the nave and aisles, the apse, which was visible from every portion of the vast structure, became a fitting place for the altar. Transepts were subsequently introduced, for the twofold purpose of admitting a greater number of worshippers and of reducing the whole

building to the form of a cross. Simultaneously with this development of the old Roman basilicas there arose in Constantinople, now the seat of imperial dominion, a style known as the Byzantine, and characterized by the cupola as its peculiar feature. But the artistic genius of the Church is ever prolific ; and so, through embellishing the basilicas by the introduction of the rounded arch, and the addition of some unimportant features of the Byzantine style, she produced the Romanesque, which under various forms continued in common use down to the twelfth century. The renaissance of a later date was a revival of many of its principles ; and that under this, its most developed form, it is capable of almost infinite embellishment, will be manifest at once by a glance at St. Peter's in Rome. Gibbon speaks of this superb structure as " the most glorious edifice that has ever been applied to the purposes of religion." And Byron, in his *Childe Harold*, apostrophizes it as follows :—

" But lo ! the dome—the vast and wondrous dome !
To which Diana's marvel was a cell !
Christ's mighty shrine above His martyr's tomb !
I have beheld the Ephesian's miracle—
Its columns strew the wilderness, and dwell
The hyena and the jackal in their shade.
I have beheld Sophia's bright roofs swell
Their glittering mass in the sun ; and have surveyed
Its sanctuary, the while the usurping Moslem prayed.

But thou, of temples old or altars new,
Standest alone—with nothing like to thee—
Worthiest of God the holy and the true !
Since Zion's desolation, when that He
Forsook his former city, what could be,
Of earthy structures, in His honour piled
Of a sublimer aspect ? Majesty,
Power, Glory, Strength, and Beauty—all are aisled
In this eternal ark of worship undefiled."

But though this style has decided advantages, because of its strength and solidity, and the facilities it affords for mural decoration, yet to most minds it seems less suitable for purposes of religious worship than the pointed or Gothic style which arose in the twelfth century. The chief points

of difference between Grecian and Gothic architecture are indicated by Cardinal Wiseman as follows:—

“The architectures of Greece and Rome, like their religion, kept their main lines horizontal or parallel to the earth, and carefully avoided breaking this direction, seeking rather its prolongation than any striking elevation. The Christian architecture threw up its lines so as to bear the eye towards heaven; its tall, tapering, and clustering pillars, while they even added apparent to real height, served as guides and conductors, of the sense, to the fretted roof, and prevented the recurrence of lines which would keep its direction along the surface of the earth. Nothing could more strikingly mark the contrast between the two religious systems. The minute details of its workmanship, the fretting and carving of its many ornaments, the subdivision of masses into smaller portions, are all in admirable accord with the mental discipline of the time which subtilized and divided every matter of its inquiry, and reduced the greatest questions into a cluster of ever ramifying distinctions. The ‘dim religious light that passed through the storied window, and gave a mysterious awe to the cavern-like recesses of the building, excellently became an age passionately fond of mystic lore and the dimmest twilights of theological learning. Nothing could be more characteristic, nothing more expressive, of the religious spirit which ruled those ages than the architecture which in them arose.”

Few, therefore, can look upon a Gothic Church without being sensibly struck by its suitability for religious worship. It has been well styled by a modern writer, *la pensée celtique*, the architectural expression of religious thought; and, if we contemplate the spiritual meaning of its various parts, we shall find the mysteries of time and eternity, of nature and grace, of the mutual relations of God and man, receiving eloquent expression in this grand epic of stone.

The building itself,¹ constructed artistically of innumerable stones drawn from the bowels of the earth—some sustaining and others sustained, some fundamental and others towering aloft in tapering spire and transparent

¹ To render more intelligible many allusions in this essay, it may be necessary to mention that it was originally written for the purpose of being delivered as a lecture before the students of Maynooth, and that the writer had before his mind in this paragraph the beautiful new Church attached to the College.

lantern—are they not symbolical of the mystic body of Christ, constituted of men, who by nature are of the earth, earthly, but by the mysterious operations of grace are raised to occupy various positions of dignity and responsibility in the moral edifice of the Church? The great western window with its fantastic tracery—which Sir Walter Scott in one of his lighter moods would describe as if

“Some fairy’s hand
Twixt poplars light the ozier wand
In many a freakish knot had twined,
Then framed a spell, when the work was done,
And changed the willow wreaths to stone,”

will suggest to the mind of the contemplative a widely different thought. The circle with its variously-coloured lights, filled with angels and prophets and apostles, all converging towards the centre, where the Redeemer sits enthroned—what is it but a symbol of eternity, in which the hierarchy of the intellectual creation surround as with a garland the Divine Person of the Son of God, deriving strength and stability from their close relations with Him. The storied windows reveal as in a vision the most instructive incidents in the Saviour’s life, and ever preach in silent eloquence to the thoughtful worshipper beneath. The richly decorated roof unrolls itself above, like the azure vault of heaven, and from it look down the prophets of the Old and the saints of the New Testament, to inspire a stronger faith, to excite a livelier hope, to inflame a more ardent charity, in all who come beneath their influence. From the string-courses on the walls and the corbels that support the pillars, symbolic figures, suggestive of religious thought, come forth, as if in obedience to the voice of the Church, who, speaking through those present, calls upon all creation to bless the name of the Lord. On the walls around are represented the chief scenes in the sacred passion of the Redeemer, bringing forcibly before the mind the most useful lessons, the most edifying examples, the most appealing manifestations of love, in the whole life of Christ. When in unison with these combining influences of sculpture,

painting, and architecture, the grand organ peals forth its music, and the choir gives sympathetic expression to the sublime poetry of the Church—when the whole edifice from floor to ceiling pulsates with a wave of harmony that wafts the soul upon its bosom to the limits of the eternal shore—few can fail to be convinced that the Catholic Church has made Art the handmaid of religion, and one of her most powerful auxiliaries in the great work of saving souls.

No wonder, therefore, that the Church has ever been an enthusiastic Patroness of Art! No wonder she repels with indignation the malignant calumny of her enemies that she has always been opposed to the progress of civilization. In every country in the world she has been the pioneer of progress and the teacher of civilization. Her divine mission is to civilize and convert the world, and for the purpose of achieving this object she disdains not to make use of every legitimate means within her reach—the productions of created genius as well as the inspired teaching of the word of God; and therefore she promotes the study of both. Such is the manifest record of her history in the past, and shall also be the guiding principle of her policy in the future. Her enemies may revile and calumniate her; but while they shall ever remain as they have been, unstable as water, she will continue the line of policy she has hitherto pursued, approving herself the jealous guardian of truth and rectitude in the study of science, human and divine, as well as in the cultivation of the various departments of Art.

J. J. CLANCY.

Liturgical Questions.¹

DE CONSECRATIONE ECCLESIAE CUM ALTARI.

In quadam dioecesi Episcopus nova cum Ecclesia altare maius fixum, ut par est, consecravit. Huius vero lapidis pars media, ubi sepulcrum extabat pro recondendis Reliquiis, per totum erat excavata, seu perforata: ita ut non super mensa, sed super eius structura fuerit locata Reliquiarum capsula. Pars vero excavata pro operculo inserviit sepulcri, quod coementi ope optime clausum fuit. Aliquo post tempore Episcopalis Caeremoniarum magister, qui consecrationem altaris moderatus erat, gravibus angi coepit scrupulis circa validitatem consecrationis, non solum altaris, sed et ipsius Ecclesiae. Animadverterat enim, Ecclesiam propter altare consecrari, ut si invalida sit huius, illius etiam sit invalida consecratio, cum Ecclesia sine uno saltem altari consecrari non possit. Quaeritur:

1. *Quid sit altare fixum, et quaenam conditiones sint necessariae, ex parte lapidis, ut valide consecretur?*

2. *Quid de effato, Ecclesia propter altare, et quomodo intelligendum?*

3. *Quid iudicandum de validitate seu altaris seu Ecclesiae consecrationis, sicut de facto, et argumentandi ratione Caeremoniarum magistri, ut in casu?*

SOLUTIO.²

1. Quaeritur primo quid pro altari fixo sit intelligendum, et quaenam necessario conditiones requirantur, ut valide consecrari possit.

Altaria, uti exploratum est, in fixa et mobilia seu portatilia, generatim distinguuntur. Nihilominus tam fixum

¹ We are indebted to the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* for the following interesting dissertation on a case of doubt in regard to the consecration of a new church.—ED. I. E. R.

² Ex dissertatione Rev. Dom. Eduardi Brettoni, ex alumnis Almi Collegii Capranicensis, habita in Ecclesia Presbyterorum Missionis prope Curiam Innocentianam, die 22 Maii, 1889: acta Epitoma per R. mum Dom. Dom. Philippum M. Canon. Difava.

quam portatile altare duplici sensu potest sumi. Etenim lato quodam sensu, recto tamen, fixum dici potest altare simpliciter ob suam constructionem, quae stabilis est et immobilis, super cuius nihilominus mensa sacer collocatur lapis, qui et inde possit amoveri. Eiusmodi altaris fixi significationem accepimus ex uno ex Decretis S. C. Indulgentiarum d. d. 26 Mart. 1867, quod declarat, altare praefata ratione *fixum* ita esse posse privilegiatum, ut Indulgentia pro altari, alio sensu describendo fixo concessas, lucrari valeat. En verba decreti: "Sanctitas sua edixit et declaravit, sufficere ad constituendam qualitatem altaris *fixi*, ut in medio altaris stabilis et inamovibilis, licet non consecrati lapis consecratus etiam amovibilis ponatur (*V. et Decr.*, S. R. Congr. d. d. 31 Aug. 1867, n. 5386.)" Item, sensu minus proprio, portatile seu mobile dici potest altare, quod ligneam habeat mensam, in cuius medio sit sacer lapis, uti quandoque erigitur in Ecclesiis, ratione alicuius solemnitatis, puta Patroni, qua expleta, destruitur (*V. De Herdt Prax. Sacr. Liturg.*, pars. i., n. 176). Animadvertas tamen velim, altare, nuper descripto modo fixum, ex parte lapidis eas tantum exigere conditiones, quae pro altari portatili requiruntur.

Proprio verum liturgicoque sensu altare seu fixum seu portatile satis est diversum. Itaque hoc altero sensu altare fixum dicitur illud, cuius mensa ex uno constans lapide, integramque immobiliter tegens superficiem, adeo undequaque adhaeret basi, eique coniungitur, ut quid unum cum ipsa efformet. Ita Liturgici auctores communiter. Scriptores nihilominus antiquiores, fixa describentes altaria, de integritate lapidis haud explicite verba faciunt, necessariam tamen aperte retinent mensae cum basi coniunctionem, quam essentielle dicunt discrimen constituere, per quod fixum altare a portatili differt. Consuli ad rem poterunt Giraldius (*Iur. Pontif.*, tom. ii., pag. 419), Gatticus (*De usu altar. portat.*, cap. i., n. 10, xiii.), Ferraris (*ad. voc.* Altare) alique plures.

Altare autem portatile simplex est parvusque generatim lapis consecratus, haud immobiliter basi adhaerens, qui huc illuc transferri potest, et super quamcumque locatur mensam, ut ibi Sacrificium fiat,

Notionibus generalibus expositis circa altare fixum, licet connexionis causa quid dicere et de portatili coacti fuerimus, gradum facimus, prouti petitio inquit, ad eas assignandas conditiones, quae necessario requiruntur ex parte lapidis, ut altare fixum possit valide consecrari.

Prima conditio, quam cetera ipsa petitio supponere videtur, est ut materia altaris fixi sit omnino ex lapide. Quidquid de antiquitate fuerit, iuxta praesentem Ecclesiae disciplinam, quae a tempore circiter Silvestri Papae I incepit, huiusmodi materia ad validitatem pertinet, ut si ex alia altare consecratur, nihil fiat. Ita aperte Rubrica Missalis: "Altare lapideum esse debet (tit. xx.)" Ita canon *Altaria* Agathensis Concilii, quem Gratianus refert (*De Consecr. Dist. i., can. 31*): "Altaria si non fuerint lapidea, chrismatis unctione non consecrantur." Ita omnes Liturgici, ita universalis consuetudo. Adeo ut proinde, quaecumque alia materies sive naturaliter sive arte confecta, licet lapidis similitudinem praeseferat, quae verus non sit lapis, inepta sit pro altari, atque invalide consecratur. Altera conditio formam respicit ipsius lapidis, ut nempe rectangula sit. Sane seu Missale seu Pontificale, atque reliqui codices liturgici, de lateribus verba faciunt cornibusque altarium. Praeterea altare rotundae vel alterius formae confectum, adeo a constanti universalique consuetudine discreparet, ut potius religioso sensui iniuriam irrogaret, et tamquam aliquid profani iudicaretur ab omnibus. Denique impar omnino eiusmodi altare esset, ut rite fieri in eo possent sacrae unctiones, quae a Pontificali Romano praescribuntur.

Tertia conditio est, ut ita mensa immobiliter adhaereat undequaque inferiori structurae: ut, sicuti superius diximus, rem unam cum ea constituat. Hinc est, quod mensae a structura inferiori separatio, altaris execrationem inducit. Quod certo constat ex iure, ubi legitur, altare execratum evadere si tabula remota fuerit (*Cap. Quod., De Consecr. Eccl.*). Item patet ex decreto, praeter alia, in *Senogallien.* d. d. 15 Maii, 1819, n. 4562. Super qua conditione animadvertendum est, structuram qua mensa fulcitur, seu stipitem, ex lapide esse debere; aut saltem necessum est, ut latera seu columellae, quibus mensa sustentatur, sint ex lapide,

licet ex lateribus esse possit interior pars structuræ. Haec omnia constant ex decretis S. R. Congregationis 20 Dec., 1864, n. 5338, et 7 Aug., 1875, n. 5621, quibus inhaerens cl. Martinucci eadem expresse docet (lib. vii., cap. xvii., n. 1). Et ratio patet, quia cum de fixis agatur altaribus, stipes, ut dictum est, quid unum cum mensa efformat: altare autem debet esse lapideum.

Quarta conditio est, ut nisi sepulcrulum reliquiarum habeatur vel in centro, vel in anteriori, aut posteriori, vel etiam in summitate stipitis, prout docet Pontificale Romanum (*De consecr. altaris*), idem Reliquiarum sepulcrulum esse debet effossum in ipso lapide, in quo recondendae sunt, et operculo pariter lapideo claudendae reliquiae.

Alio conditio manet, de qua disserendum est in praesenti, utrum ad validitatem vel ad solam liceitatem pertineat, estque integritas lapidis. Equidem in antiquis canonibus explicita omnino lex de lapide integro in fixis altaribus non reperitur, ita ut mensa pluribus constans partibus, arte tamen inter se bene coniunctis, incapax sit iudicanda consecrationis. Imo cl. Gatticus diligentior ea super re scriptor eximius, ingenue fatetur, neque hanc legem se reperisse pro altaribus mobilibus, pro quibus fortior profecto ratio militat, neque ullum decretum explicitum se legisse. Nihilominus pro his integritatem sustinet, asserens inutilem fuisse hoc de negotio legem, cum faveat integritati universalis consuetudo. Quidquid sit ceterum de mobilibus, ad fixa quod spectat altaria constat ne, debere, ea esse ex uno integroque lapide confecta? Negative respondemus, quin imo certum est oppositum, si de validitate quaestio sit. Revera, si de antiquitate loquamur indubium est altaria ex uno generatim fuisse lapide facta, quod una vel plures columnae sustentabant, ut cl. Martene refert. Sed et ipse de altari loquitur, quod erat in maiori Turonensi Monasterio exstructum, et a S. Martino consecratum dicitur, cuius mensa ex quatuor constabat lapidibus inter se coniunctis. Auctores autem ita de fixis loquuntur altaribus, ut ostendant, ea ex pluribus quoque lapidibus esse posse. Ita Giraldus (*Iur. Pontif.*, tom. ii., pag. 417) ait: *Eadem tabula, vel saltem mox dicta ara, RECTIUS consistit in unico lapide, quam divisa in plures.* Ex quo patet,

lapidem esse posse non integrum, quamvis integer sit praeferendus. Item Gatticus dicit, caeremoniarum magistros exigere communiter in altaribus fixis lapidem unum integrum, sed statim addit: "quantum locorum opportunitas patitur (cap. ii., n. 13)." Pontificale Romanum loquitur quidem de *lapide, tabula, ara*, etc., quae verba singulariter posita unum integrumque lapidem significare videntur. Nihilominus nemo nescit, plures lapides simul coemento, vel mastice, coniunctos pro uno atque integro lapide merito haberi. Neque aliquid in oppositum e symbolica altaris significatione eruitur, quae Christum respicit. Simon Thesalonicensis scribit: "E lapide est altare, quia Christum refert, qui etiam petra nominatur . . . caput anguli, et lapis angularis (lib. 3, *De templo*.)" Idque divus Thomas explicat (p. 3, q. 83), estque conforme verbis Apostoli: "petra autem erat Christus (*Ad Corinth. i.*, cap. x., v. 4)." Verum, licet huiusmodi symbolismi ratio magni sit facienda, ut lapis integer adhibeatur, iuxta universalem consuetudinem, non est nihilominus, cur dicendum sit hanc deficere rationem si lapis ex pluribus constet partibus, cum sint apte solideque inter se coniunctae.

Si denique positivam legem inspiciamus, quaedam profecto decreta se nobis exhibent, quae integritatem exigunt. Ita S. R. C. d. 17 Iun., 1843 (*Decr.* 4966) decernit, *mensam ex sex parvis lapidibus ad formam unius unitis, quam lignea corona per gyrum devincit et cum stipite coniungit, et super qua sacri olei unctiones fuere peractae*, non esse consecratam nec consecrandam; praescribitque simul, ut eadem *mensa ex integro lapide constituatur*. Sed animadvertendum, agi in casu de mensa, quae non solum integritate caret, sed lignea circumdata fuit corona, per quam mensa stipiti coniungebatur, et super qua unctiones fuere peractae: quae omnia profecto invalidam consecrationem reddunt. Alterum quoque recentius legimus decretum d. d. 29 Aug., 1885, quod respicit pariter mensam, *cui tamquam corona, zona marmorea obducitur per ferri laminas coniuncta ipsi lapidi, ita ut mensa non constet unico lapide*. Et S. R. C. respondet, altare huiusmodi, tamquam fixum non esse rite constructum, cum tota mensa ex uno et integro lapide constare debeat.

Ex quo utroque decreto nil eruitur contra validitatem consecrationis mensae, quae ex pluribus constat lapidibus; iure tamen merito instruimur, id esse contra legis praescriptum. Cl. De Herdt docet, *tabulam superiorem altaris fixi debere constare ex uno et integro lapide, et non pluribus lapidibus ad formam unius unitis, et quidem, UT VIDETUR DICENDUM, de validitate consecrationis (Prax. S. Liturg., pars. i., n. 176)*. Sed eius incertitudo nulla est, quia decreto innititur 17 Iun., 1843, quod superius retulimus et explicavimus. Ceterum et ipse admittit, lapidem etiam enormiter fractum iam consecratum posse firmiter coementari iterumque ut execratum consecrari. Si ergo valida est haec consecratio post execrationem, valida etiam erit, si prima vice, postquam mastice solide coniuncti lapides fuerint ad formam unius, rite consecrentur.

Denique impraesenti omnis adimitur dubitandi ratio, cum explicitum habeamus decretum d. d. 20 Martii, 1869, n. 5437, quo docemur, altare enormiter fractum si firmiter coementatum, valide consecrari posse, et dubium de validitate esse nullum. Concludimus ergo, praeter quatuor praefatas condiciones, quae requiruntur, hanc ultimam, integritatem scilicet lapidis unius, ad validitatem non requiri, sed licitum solummodo respicere.

2. Altera petitio quaerit quid dicendum de effato: *Ecclesia propter altare*, et quo sensu intelligendum sit.

Respondemus, nil eo sapientius, quod tradidit antiquitas, retinemus impraesentia, et cui praxis universalis mire respondet. Hinc potuit quidem extare, immo et certe extitit in primis Ecclesiae saeculis, si materialiter loquamur, altare sine Ecclesia; sed nusquam legimus Ecclesiam sine altari extitisse. Institui quaestio potest, utrum revera in prima antiquitate unum tantum erigendi mos fuerit in Ecclesiis altare, vel plura; sed sine ullo altari nulla unquam extitit, neque extare potest Ecclesia, quippe quae neque mereretur Ecclesiae nomen.

Ecclesia enim graeca quidem vox est, quae *adunatio* latine significat; sed usus postea obtinuit, ut pro ea locus ille intelligeretur, in quem peculiariter conveniunt fideles, ut cultum publicum Deo exhibeant. Maximus autem cultus

actus, atque essentialis, et ad quem ceteri ordinantur, Sacrificium est, quod Deo unice offertur, ut supremam eius dominationem agnoscamus, nostramque ab eo omnimodam dependentiam. Merito itaque Sacrificium in Ecclesia offertur, quae ad cultum exclusive destinatur. Iam vero ubi Sacrificium, nisi super altare? Christiana enim lege nonnisi super eo illud fieri permittimur. Idque eo magis, quod novi foederis Sacrificium antiquis excellit, quorum complementum est atque perfectio; in illis enim nonnisi umbra, in nostro, autem absoluta veritas. Hinc Sacrificium nostrum iure meritoque appellatur Sacrificium altaris.

Est itaque altare, quod perfectius haberi in Ecclesia potest, ad quod Ecclesia eadem ordinatur, et propter quod construitur, atque existit, ut si ab altare abstrahas nil sit Ecclesia. Hinc sapientissima ordinatio, ut nulla unquam dedicetur seu consecretur Ecclesia, quin cum ea aliquod consecretur altare. Hinc altare istud esse fixum debet, sicque stabilitatis Ecclesiae fiat particeps, et nunquam ista sine altare, neque ad tempus, maneat. Hinc ipsum altare, maius, quod cum Ecclesia consecrandum decernitur, tamquam reliquis, quae esse in illa possunt, excellentius. Haec autem ex pluribus S. R. Congregationis decretis explicite patescunt. Nil ergo magis aequum ac sapiens iudicandum quam praedictum effatum: *Ecclesia propter altare.*

At quonam effatum istud sensu intelligendum est? Nil hac responsione facilius post ea quae nuper exposuimus: sensus nempe est, ut, quamvis Ecclesia ab altari, uti patet, nimis differat, nihilominus idea illius vix istius ideam valeat excludere, quia sine altari non datur Ecclesia. Ecclesia enim fit ad Sacrificium; cumque hoc nonnisi super altari offerri possit, ideo Ecclesia propter altare dicitur. Est ergo altare, finis Ecclesiae, ad quod talem intimam simulque necessariam dicit relationem, ut sine hoc eam consistere prorsus inutile sit.

Nihilominus animadvertendum, sicuti altare ab Ecclesia differt, ita altaris consecrationem essentialiter ab Ecclesiae consecratione differre. Idque perspicuum est ex ritibus, quos Pontificale Romanum praescribit. Separatim namque parietes Ecclesiae forinsecus benedicuntur, sicuti iuxta

fundamentum ipsorum et in media parte, intrinsecus. Item alii ritus perficiuntur super pavimentum atque in aliis Ecclesiae partibus. Omnes autem hos ritus comitantur peculiaries orationes; quae cuncta distincta omnino sunt, ac diversa ab iis, quae pro altaris consecratione fiunt, uti in ipso Pontificali videre est. Licet ergo indubitanter tenendum sit, Ecclesiam esse propter altare, nihilominus, alterum ab altero essentialiter distingui, pariter exploratum est. Proinde, uti iam diximus, consecratione altaris vix habet aliquid communis cum consecratione Ecclesiae, quamvis utriusque consecrationis ritus, distincte tamen, quandoque alternentur. Hinc altaris consecratio ab Ecclesiae consecratione non dependet.

3. Demum inquit casus, quid sit iudicandum de validitate altaris Ecclesiaeque consecrationis, de facti serie, et de argumentandi ratione Caeremoniarum magistri.

Inficiandum non est, ad Ecclesiae quod attinet consecrationem, rite hanc fuisse peractam, ut supponit casus: ergo merito iudicandum, manere omnino consecratam Ecclesiam. Neque obstat, si altare invalide consecratum fuisse censeatur. Nam, uti ex principiis in secunda responsione positis liquido profluit, invalida consecratio altaris nil influit in consecrationem Ecclesiae, cum duo sint actus inter se distincti, licet alter ad alterum ordinatus. Neque ob stare possunt aliqui ritus, qui in commune fiunt super altare et Ecclesiam, quia, iis haud obstantibus, consecratio unius non est consecratio alterius. S. R. Congregatio in una *Fanensi* expetita fuit, quid de Ecclesiae consecratione sentiendum, quando execratum est altare, cum Ecclesia sine altari nequeat consecrari. Porro Sacrum Tribunal respondit simpliciter: *Ecclesiam fuisse rite consecratam* (17 Iun., 1843, ad 2). Ergo, inferimus, Ecclesia etiam sine altari consecrato, valide manere consecrata potest. Addas velim, omnes in casu praescriptos adhibitos fuisse ritus pro consecratione altaris, ut per accidens censendum sit, si in hypothesi consecratum valide non fuit. Stat ergo valida consecratio Ecclesiae, licet cum invalida consecratione altaris.

At dicendum ne, huiusmodi consecrationem altaris fuisse certo invalidam? Ita quidem iudicandum esse videtur, quia lapis mensam constituens revera abruptus est. Neque dicas

coementatum illum esse, atque unum totum efformare operculum cum alia principaliori altaris parte. Quia coniunctio eiusmodi haud talis est, ut quid unum integrumque constituat lapidem; cum fieri tantum soleat in superiori parte et ad instar operculi, non vero ut ex duabus partibus unus fiat lapis, quemadmodum evenit, quando duae vel plures lapidis partes solido stabilique coemento, vel potius mastice, simul coniunguntur, ut unus fiat. Cum itaque lapis iste integer non sit neque ita coniunctae partes, ut unus evaserit, ineptus ille videtur pro consecratione. Esse autem eiusmodi consecrationem prorsus illicitam, nec innuere necessum est, cum ex superius expositis satis lex pateat, quae unum integrumque lapidem exigit. Ceterum, dubia ad minus illa altaris consecratio est, proindeque super eum Sacrificium non potest fieri; sed prius competens consulenda est auctoritas, ut iudicio suo quid agendum sit notum faciat.

Denique vituperanda nimis agendi ratio magistri Caeremoniarum, cui ante functionem studio incumbendum erat, ut omnia rite postea peragerentur, quae Pontificale Romanum in casu praescribit. Ex studio enim rationabili, profecto, subortum fuisset illi dubium, utrum lapidis in media parte perforati valida esset consecratio. Ceterum de tali non licita consecratione, quam Episcopus operatus est, Caeremoniarum magister qua ratione possit excusari vix capimus.

Correspondence.

HISTORY OF THE CEREMONIAL OF HOLY MASS.

“Since the appearance of the above article in the July number of the I. E. RECORD, two priests have kindly sent me the following corrections:—

“Father Dallow, of Upton, near Birkenhead, England, writes:—

“‘I read your article in current I. E. RECORD with deepest

interest; but may I point out what seems to be two slight errors?

“1. You say that (in canon of mass) Thaddeus is the same as Timothy. Now I find in every book I’ve consulted that Thaddeus is the same as St. Jude. In Roman martyrology it puts—“Thadeus qui vocatur Judas.” In St. Matt. x. 3, Thaddeus is placed among the twelve Apostles.

“2. By decree of Sac. Rit. Congregatio., 4452, it is fixed that the John spoken of first in second list, after elevation, is *John the Baptist*, and that the head is to be therefore bowed at that name at every mass, in commemoration of the Baptist.

“On the famous *Ardagh chalice* in Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, comes the name TATHÆUS among names of Apostles.’

“Father FitzPatrick, writing from St. Thomas’s Seminary, Merriam Park, Ramsay Co., Minnesota, says:—

“Many thanks for your article “History of the Ceremonial of Holy Mass,” begun in the July number of the I. E. RECORD. Such papers, and the articles that appeared about two years ago, on the Ceremonies of Mass¹ in the same admirable periodical, must ever prove of fascinating interest—because so living, so spiritual, to *all*, but especially to those of the faith.

“To record an instance of the good effects of such writings. Some years ago a non-Catholic lady of St. Louis, Mo., happened to pick up the *Ceremonies of Low Mass*, by Father Hughes. She read, and read, and read, always with growing curiosity, always with more intensely devout interest; and when, after rightly discerning that there must be something there—something beneath and behind those many minute rubrical directions—a truth, a dogma, a reality—she received and corresponded with the grace of faith—faith in the Real Presence, *mysterium Fidei*. She at once sought ample religious instruction, and became a Catholic.

“And now be pleased to suffer a few animadversions on parts of your article.

“Page 604. “Simon, and Thaddeus or *Timothy*,” should read “Simon, and Thaddeus or *Jude*.”

“Page 605. The St. John in the second list is the Holy Baptist and Precursor. (*Vide* Decr. S.R.C., 27 Mar., 1824., apud *Decreta Authentica*, page 145. See also O’Brien’s *Hist. of the Mass*.)

“There need be no surprise that the proto-martyr of the New Law should *immediately* follow St. John, the *last* martyr of the Old Law, and that the two post-ascension Apostles, Mathias and Barnabas, should continue the enumeration.

¹By Rev. Daniel O’Loan.

“Mark well, also, that *Anastasia* was a widow-martyr, her name following the names of the four *virgin*-martyrs. (See Dom Queranger's *Liturgical Year*, second mass on Christmas Day, and O'Brien's *Hist. of the Mass*.) The *Anastasia* closing the second list could not have been the earlier or elder saint *Anastasia* who suffered under Valerian, or, it may be, under Nero. Many writers, however, rank all these five martyrs as virgins; but erroneously, in my judgment.

“The error of Berengarius was practically *impanation* or *companation*; hence no *transubstantiation*. He held that Christ was in no manner present upon the words of consecration being pronounced, “*vi verborum*,” but sometime after, and then by annexing Himself to the oblata. With the condemnation of his errors on the Holy Eucharist, came the *enjoined*, solemn, and demonstrative liturgical act, which now may be termed the *major* elevation, in contradistinction to the simultaneous raising of host and chalice, which now may be called the *minor* elevation. This latter still continues in the Latin Church (though your words seem to imply the contrary), and in some countries is announced by the sanctuary bell or gong. It was once the only elevation at mass—the *elevation* without any additional ceremony. The Good Friday liturgy, so ancient, points to this. The prescribing of the elevation (and intermediate genuflection) right upon the consecration, strikingly represents or exemplifies the maxim, *Lex credendi, Lex orandi*, and in worship as well as in teaching stamped out the error condemned. The primitive elevation expresses the *Latreutical end* of the Holy Sacrifice, *omnis honor et gloria*, very appropriately. Our *major* elevation needed no introduction into the Oriental liturgies, as the error it condemns was a *Western* one, and was not even partially broached or bruited in the Orient. Oriental liturgies, however, have also a very solemn and highly demonstrative elevation just before the Communion. (See O'Brien's *History of the Mass*.)

“Many readers of the I. E. RECORD will be glad, as I am, to have these things brought to their knowledge or their recollection, and will feel grateful, as I most humbly do, to these two good priests for having done so.

“R. O'KENNEDY.”

Document.

DECISIONS OF THE S. PENITENTIARY ON THE ABSOLUTION
OF CASES AND CENSURES RESERVED TO THE HOLY SEE.

EMINENTISSIME DOMINE,

Post decretum S. Cong. R. et U. Inquisitionis absolutionem a casibus Rom. Pontifici spectans, datum sub die 23 Junii 1886, sequentia dubia occurrunt mihi missionario, quorum nequidem in recentioribus auctoribus solutionem reperire mihi possibile est; quapropter hanc ab Eminentia Vestra sollicite imploro.

I. Decreti responsio ad I^m quae sic se habet: “Attenta praxi S. Poenitentiariae, praesertim ab edita Constitutione Apostolica s. m. Pii IX quae incipit *Apostolicae Sedis*, negative,” non videtur respicere casus specialiter reservatos Sum. Pontifici sine censura; siquidem de his non agitur in Constitutione *Apostolicae Sedis*. Numquid ergo integra manet vetus doctrina Theologorum dicentium de his absolvere posse episcopos vel eorum delegatos, vel, ut vult Castropalao, simplicem sacerdotem, quando poenitens Romam nequit petere, quin scribere necesse sit?

II. Quando indultum quinquennale Episcopi habent a S. Congregatione de Propaganda Fide, complectens 14 numeros et n^o 10^o concedens facultatem absolvendi ab omnibus casibus etiam specialiter reservatis R. P., excepto casu absolvantis complicem, numquid illam possunt delegare in Gallia et in Europa pro casu saltem particulari? ita ut non necessarium sit ut poenitens adeat episcopum ipsum, quamvis in n^o 12^o indulti sic haec clausula: “Communicandi has facultates in totum vel in partem prout opus esse secundum ejus conscientiam judicaverit, sacerdotibus idoneis in conversione animarum laborantibus in locis tantum ubi prohibetur exercitium catholicae religionis?”

III. Posito quod negative respondeatur, quid si poenitenti impossibile sit adire Episcopum tale indultum habentem?

IV. Quando sedes episcopalis vacat, numquid Vicarius capitularis potest communicare facultates quinquennales Episcopo amoto vel defuncto concessas per indultum S. Poenitentiariae vel Congregationis de Propaganda Fide?

V. Certe hodie integra viget facultas a Tridentino concessa Episcopis absolvendi a simpliciter reservatis occultis, sed quaeritur utrum tale decretum attingat casus simpliciter servatos eodem modo ac specialiter servatos Sum. Pontifici?

VI. Quando missionario occurrit poenitens censuris innodatus et transiens obiter, ita ut missionarius non possit iterum poenitentem videre, numquid sufficit, posito casu urgentiori absolutionis, exigere a poenitente promissionem scribendi, tacito si vult nomine, ad S. Poenitentiariam intra mensem, et standi illius mandatis, quin confessarius ipse scribat?

VII. Utrum, tuta conscientia, docetur et in praxim deducitur, ut quidam volunt, propter hodiernum periculum ne aperiantur epistolae a potestate civili, non requiri ut epistola ad Summum Pontificem dirigatur in casibus urgentioribus, vel quando adiri nequit Papa?

VIII. Posito quod non requiratur epistola ad Summum Pontificem, numquid requiratur epistola directa ad Episcopum, stante hoc generali periculo, praesertim quando agitur de absolutione complicitis, quae etiam perfidiose detecta et revelata scandalum generare potest?

Horum dubiorum solutionem ab Eminentia Vestra fiducialiter expectans et Ejus sacram purpuram exosculans,

Illius, humillimum et addictissimum servum me fateor.

A.

Sacra Poenitentiaria, mature consideratis expositis, ad proposita dubia respondet :

Ad I^m. *Negative.*

Ad II^m, III^m, et IV^m. *Orator consulat Episcopum, et, quatenus opus sit, idem Episcopus recurrat ad Sacram Supremam Congregationem universalis Inquisitionis.*

Ad V^m. *Affirmative, nisi casus sint occulti.*

Ad VI^m. *Affirmative.*

Ad VII^m. *Negative, cum in precibus nomina et cognomina sint supprimenda.*

Ad VIII^m. *Provisum in VII^o.*

Datum Romae, in Sacra Poenitentiaria, die 7 Novembris, 1888.

Notices of Books.

PONTIFICALE ROMANUM SUMMORUM PONTIFICUM JUSSU
EDITUM A BENEDICTO XIV. ET LEONE XIII. PONT.
MAX. RECOGNITUM ET CASTIGATUM. Editio prima post
Typicam. (Sine Cantu): Pustet, Ratisbonæ. 1891.

THE eminent printing firm of Pustet deserves well of the clergy everywhere for the zeal they have shown in supplying beautiful reprints of the Church manuals in so many departments of ecclesiastical study. Amongst the latest publications of the Pustet press is a Roman Pontifical, without musical notation, complete in one large octavo volume.

It is needless to say that the paper and type are good; and it must be for the reader—more particularly for the bishop when using the pontifical at a ceremony—a great convenience to have the plain text before him, and thus be relieved from the embarrassment of trying to connect the syllables of each word when disjointed and spread out to suit the musical notes.

The Substitute of the Sacred Congregation testifies that this issue has been compared [with the typical edition, and exactly corresponds with it. This addition is also enriched with an appendix containing *in extenso* the dedication of a church in which are many altars for consecration, also the form of consecrating several altars at the same time, but as a distinct ceremony from the consecration of the church. The price of the book is 4 marks 80 c.

PRECES ANTE ET POST MISSAM. ACCEDUNT HYMNI,
LITANIAE ALIAEQUE PRECES IN FREQUENTIORIBUS
PUBLICIS SUPPLICATIONIBUS USITATAE: Pustet, Ratis-
bonæ. 1891.

THIS will be found to be a useful book in every sacristy. In addition to the *Preces ante et post Missam*, as found in the Missal, it contains the hymns, litanies, and prayers which are in use at the ordinary public devotions in church. For instance, it has the litanies and prayers for the Quarant 'Ore, the prayers appropriate to different confraternity meetings, and, of course, the Benediction service. The rubrics for each function are given in

full. I notice that in the rubric for Benediction it is laid down that the deacon is to place the Monstrance in the hands of the celebrant, who receives it kneeling. If this is correct, our common practice is at fault. But the priest himself places the Monstrance on the altar. I note, moreover, that according to this rubric, the deacon does not, after Benediction, descend the steps at the same time with the celebrant and sub-deacon, but remains on the predella to replace the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle. I suppose there is no doubt that, as laid down in this rubric also, the humeral veil should not be removed from the shoulders of the celebrant when genuflecting on the predella, but only when he has come down *in planum*. Here is the rubric as given in this book:—"Cantatis orationibus, sacerdos in infimo gradu genuflexus accipit velum humerale. Interim diaconus ad altare ascendit et ostensorium e throno depromptum tradit in manus celebrantis in supremo altaris gradu cum subdiacono genuflexi: et celebrans surgens et vertens se ad populum dat benedictionem, elevantibus ministris sacris genuflexis fimbrias pluvialis. Data benedictione celebrans collocat ostensorium super altari, et facta genuflexione, descendit cum subdiacono in planum; ac amoto velo ab humeris sacerdotis, in infimo altaris gradu genuflexi manent, donec diaconus reposuerit SS. Sacramentum in tabernaculo."

EXPLANATIO CRITICA EDITIONIS BREVIARII ROMANI QUAE
A SACRA CONGREGATIONE UTI TYPICA DECLARATA
EST. Studio et opera G. Scholier, C.SS.R.: Pustet,
Ratisbonæ. 1891.

THIS is a very learned book, and one full of interest for those who have turned their attention to the history and development of the Roman Breviary.

In an introduction which extends to nearly one hundred pages, the author discourses first on the excellence of the Divine Office as a prayer, and next on the gradual development, and the history of the various editions of the Breviary.

The chief purpose of the work is, however, to point out every particular in which the *Editio Typica*, as approved by the Sacred Congregation, differs from other editions of the Breviary. In this investigation the learned author shows a thorough acquaintance with his subject, for he descends to the most minute differences, including even the punctuation.

ARCHAEOLOGIAE BIBLICAE COMPENDIUM. Studio et Opera
P. J. Antonii A. Lovera. Typis Vallardianis. Mediolani.

WE would like to see this little book in the hands of all students of the Bible who have not time or opportunity to read some of the larger treatises on Biblical archæology.

The places mentioned in the Scripture are identified and described in this little book; many questions of chronology of deepest interest to the student are briefly discussed, and the practices of the Jews touching their rites, feasts, sacrifices, system of government, and social habits, are accurately explained.

An acquaintance with this little book could not fail to secure a largely increased interest, and, in not a few, an enthusiasm in the study of the Old and New Testament.

MDLLE. LOUISE DE MARILLAC.

The heroine of charity, Mdle. Louise de Marillac, was an only daughter of a fine old French family. She had a leaning for the cloister from childhood, but her confessor, a man in high esteem for sanctity, assured her she had no vocation. On the death of her father she married, and had a child. Her great charity and love for the poor shone forth so brilliantly among her maternal duties that she attracted the attention of S. Francis de Sales, who paid her a special visit while passing through Paris. She had the good fortune of having as a confessor St. Vincent de Paul, and under his judicious directions her natural piety developed into perfect sanctity. The penitent and confessor became co-operators in a great work of charity. St. Vincent started the association called *Dames de Charite* for visiting the sick poor. It spread like an epidemic, as he said himself. There was not a town or village in a short time that had not its charity. He needed a person in authority to go round and visit the various associations, and report on the working and results. Louise Legras, who had already materially aided him in starting it, was the person he selected. The description of her work and helpmates is very interesting. At one time, when the plague had stricken France, and panic seized the population, Louise and her companions showed that Christian love is stronger than death. She came out of it unharmed, though many of her sisters received the imperishable crown. At the request of St. Vincent she drew up a rule for the new community destined to be known all the world over as the *Filles de Charite* of St. Vincent de Paul. The book is full of interest from beginning to end, and the style is simple and pleasant.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

OCTOBER, 1891.

THE PRIVILEGE OF ADRIAN IV. TO HENRY II.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE DOCUMENT DEFENDED.

IN discussing the Privilege of Adrian, which involves not a question of faith or morals, but of historical interest, we should clearly realize the essential difference between the discipline of the twelfth and that of the nineteenth century. We should bear in mind the circumstances connected with the elevation of Adrian to the papal throne, and of Henry to the throne of England. We should remember that the Pope's bosom friends were the warmest advocates of his direct temporal power, and that Adrian himself is credited with sharing and acting on such views.¹

The constitutional law of the twelfth century invested the Pope with the right of guarding against and redressing national abuses. It was for him to decide who was to be admitted into or excluded from the family of European sovereigns. The jurisprudence of the age allowed his right to band together Catholic princes for the invasion of infidel lands or badly-governed Christian nations. In conformity with these principles, Henry II. applied to Pope Adrian IV. for the Privilege of invading Ireland. The design for the invasion of Ireland had been conceived by earlier English sovereigns, but no better occasion for such an enterprise had

¹ Adrian was understood to claim the empire as a fief; but the anger of Barbarossa called forth an explanation which Bossuet has characterised in strong terms.—Bossuet, *Œuvres*, vol. x., page 191.

hitherto offered. Ireland was then in a divided, weak, and disorderly condition; and the king was young, daring, and ambitious. Adrian ascended the papal throne at the close of the year 1154; and early in 1155 Henry sent an embassy to congratulate the English Pope on his accession, and to petition for the privilege of invading and reforming Ireland. The embassy, which consisted of three Continental bishops and the abbot of St. Alban's, was wholly successful.

There are some who distrust the authenticity of Adrian's Privilege, not because of the temporal, but because of the spiritual rights which it purports to confer. They admit the former to be consistent with the spirit and jurisprudence of the twelfth century, but insist that the latter are irreconcilable with the principles of spiritual jurisdiction. But the powers conferred on Henry were wholly executive in character, and beside, were not more ample than those conferred on others under like circumstances. A diploma given by Pope Urban II. to Roger of Sicily in the beginning of the twelfth century is a case in point. This prince and his heirs obtained, among other privileges, that no legate should be appointed in Sicily without their consent; that, should there be sent even a legate *a latere* into their kingdom for purposes of religious reform, such reform was to be carried out through the temporal princes; and that, whenever the presence of Sicilian bishops was required at a General Council, Roger and his son were to determine the number of bishops who should attend. A contemporary historian, Godfrey Malaterra, without being able to refer to the original document, gave a copy of the Privilege in his *Sicilian Monarchy*.¹ The powers it conferred were so ample, and by-and-by so exaggerated in the use, that the Privilege was questioned by ecclesiastical authorities. At length, after some four hundred years, the original diploma came to light. Baronius questioned the genuineness of the document because it differed in some respects from the copy given of old by Malaterra; but the *Regesta* of Jaffé have lately put the matter beyond further question.² He has discovered a diploma which

¹ B. iv., ch. ult.

Ad an. 1097, October, n. 4846.

was asked by Roger II., and given to him by Paschal II., and which was merely a renewal of the diploma given a few years previously to Roger I. by Urban II.

The Privilege of invading and reforming Ireland was granted in a letter which we subjoin, and there is no reason for doubting that without it the invasion would have been undertaken. Pope Adrian, a few years subsequently, in 1159, refused to sanction the invasion of Spain by Louis VII., for the purpose of relieving the Christians from the Mahommedan yoke, fearing that without the invitation or consent of the Spaniards defeat would be the result. We give a portion of this letter of refusal, side by side with the letter of assent in reference to Ireland, for purposes of comparison, and in fuller illustration of the spirit of the age:—

LETTER TO HENRY, ANNO 1155.

“Adrian, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his most dear son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, health and benediction.

“The thoughts of your magnificence are very laudably and profitably employed about acquiring for yourself renown on earth and an increase of the reward of eternal happiness in heaven, whilst as a Catholic prince you purpose to extend the boundaries of the Church, announce the truths of Christian faith to ignorant and barbarous nations, and to root out the weeds of wickedness from the Lord’s field: and the more effectually to accomplish this, you implore the counsel and favour of the Apostolic See, in which matter we are certain that the higher are your aims and the more discreet your proceedings, the happier, with God’s aid, will be the result; for those undertakings which proceed from the ardour of faith and

LETTER TO LOUIS, ANNO 1159.

“Adrian, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his most dear son in Christ, the illustrious King of the French, greeting and apostolic benediction.

“The thoughts of your magnificence are laudably and profitably employed about propagating the Christian name on earth and increasing your reward of eternal happiness in heaven, whilst you are arranging, in conjunction with our most dear son Henry, the illustrious King of the English, to hasten into Spain for the purpose of extending the boundaries of the Christian people, of crushing the barbarity of pagans, of subduing to the yoke of Christians apostate nations and such as renounce and reject the Christian faith, and whilst you carefully muster an army, and make all preparations necessary for the expedition that it may have a happy issue.

“With a view to such a result, you request the advice

love of religion are surely to have a happy end and issue.

"It is beyond any doubt, as your nobility acknowledges, that Ireland and all the islands on which Christ the sun of justice has shone, and which have received the teachings of the Catholic faith, are subject to the authority of St. Peter and of the most holy Roman Church.¹

"Wherefore we are the more anxious to sow in them a seed and plantation acceptable to God, as we know our conscience will demand a most rigorous account of us. Now, most dear son in Christ, you have signified to us that you propose entering the island of Ireland in order to subject the people to laws, and to root out the weeds of vice; that you are willing to pay out of every house a penny as an annual tribute to St. Peter, and to preserve the rights of the churches of that land whole and inviolate: we, therefore, receiving with favour your pious and laudable desire, and graciously assenting to your petition, declare that it is pleasing to us that for the sake of enlarging the limits of the Church, setting bounds to the course of vice, reforming manners, planting the seeds of virtue, and of increasing the Christian religion, you should enter that island and carry into effect these things which belong to the service of God, the salvation of the people, and that the people of

and favour of your mother, the most holy Roman Church; now we deem your proposal the more acceptable, and approve your very commendable undertakings the more that we believe they proceed from the very sincere root of charity, and your desire and purpose have had their motive in the very great ardour of faith and love of religion . . . considering that what is deferred for a time is not altogether abandoned, and carefully pondering on the difficulties that are to be encountered, we have not deemed it fit to address an admonitory and apostolic exhortation to the people of your kingdom as our venerable brother Rotrodus,² Bishop of Evreux, proposed on your part.³

¹ This claim was grounded on the following extract from the supposed Donation of Constantine to Pope Sylvester:—"Quibus ecclesiis (in Roma) pro concinnatione luminariorum possessionum prædi contulimus et rebus diversis eas ditavimus et per nostram imperialem jussionem sacram tam in oriente quam occidente . . . vel diversis *insulis* nostra largitate eis libertatem concessimus . . . patris nostri Sylvestri Pontificis successorum que ejus etc." *Corpus juris (anonici)*, Decreti 1 pars, distinct. xevi.

² Rotrodus was one of the three bishops sent by Henry II. in 1155 to ask the privilege touching Ireland.

³ Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, page 1174. Du Chesne, *Rerum franciscarum scriptores*, tom. iv., page 557; Migne *Patrologie*, tom. clxxxviii., col. 1615.

that land should receive you honourably and reverence you as lord: the rights of the churches being preserved entire and inviolate, and reserving the annual tribute of a penny from each house to St. Peter and the most holy Roman Church.¹ If, therefore, you resolve to execute these designs, study to form the people to good morals, and take such steps by yourself and those you shall find fit in faith, words, and conduct that the Church there may be adorned, that the practices of Christian faith may be introduced and increased, and that everything tending to the glory of God and the salvation of souls be so arranged by you as to deserve from God an increase of everlasting reward, and secure on earth a glorious name for ages.”²

Pope Adrian had not the same reasons for refusing Henry as for refusing Louis. The French king was told that, going to Spain as the son-in-law of King Alphonsus and as a friend to the Spanish people, he should, nevertheless, have an invitation from them, lest going uninvited, he should be abandoned by them, and be crushed by the overwhelming forces of the Mahommedans. But there was no danger that Henry would suffer a defeat from the Irish people, nor any likelihood that he would receive an invitation from them to subdue and reform them. The disorderly state of Ireland and the jurisprudence of the age explain the conduct of the Pope towards Henry. The Pope, without exactly giving Ireland away, or ordering Henry to go there, praised the motives by which the king professed to be actuated, and judged, no doubt, that the change in the political condition of the country would be richly compensated for by moral and religious advantages. By the supposed Donation of Constantine the Roman Church received from the Emperor a present of all Christian islands for defraying the expenses and maintaining the splendour of religion. A belief in the Donation was embodied in ecclesiastical treatises, and in the Canonical Decree of Gratian in the year 1151. Henry, who asked for the Privilege, and the Pope, who granted it,

¹ The Peter pence which Henry promised to the Pope would be equivalent to a moderate rent, the value of the *denarius* being considered. Henry had already offered to make the payment of Peter pence general in England, if the Pope would decide in his favour against St. Thomas of Canterbury: “Etiam adjecto, denarium beati Petri qui nunc a solis adscriptis glebæ solvitur.” Gulielmus Fitzstep., c. i., 241.

² Giraldus Cambrensis, *Hibernia Expug.*

believed in Constantine's Donation; and a belief in it continued for six hundred years, till its spuriousness was exposed by Catholic writers in the fifteenth century.¹

But for this grant of Adrian, thus antecedently probable, is there any contemporaneous evidence? Yes, Robert du Mont states that King Henry, after receiving the Privilege, consulted with the Queen mother and his Barons, who represented to him the difficulties that confronted him at home and on the Continent, and thus dissuaded him from invading Ireland.²

John of Salisbury states that he was instrumental in obtaining the Privilege from Adrian. A word on the character and the occasion of his testimony. On the elevation of Adrian to the papacy, John visited him, and remained with him three months in Beneventum.³ They were on such friendly terms that the Pope would have him eat off the same plate, and drink from the same cup with himself, and declared that he regarded John with as much love as he loved his own uterine brother.⁴ John, because of his moral and intellectual gifts, was worthy of the Pope's friendship. Feller, expressing the feeling of the Catholic world, says that he "acquired a high reputation for virtue and learning." In *Cambrensis Eversus*, whose author denied the Privilege of Adrian, it is admitted that John possessed "consummate prudence and uprightness." Cave, in his *Literary History*, calls John a man "of knowledge and integrity." The Sacred Congregation⁵ and Pope Alexander III.,⁶ in canonizing St. Thomas of Canterbury, attached the greatest importance to his testimony. John of Salisbury, morally

¹ It is not true, as stated by a writer in the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, au. 1882, fascic. 185, that before Adrian IV. no use was made of the supposed Donation. Use was made of by St. Peter Damian, in arguing against the anti-Pope Cadolaus; by Pope Leo IX., in his correspondence with Michael Cerularius; by Eneas of Paris, Ado of Vienne, and by Hincmar of Rheims. *Patrologie*, tom. cxliii., page 752. Pertz, *Scriptores*, ii. 315, Sirmond, tom. ii., page 206.

² *Patrologie*, tom. clx., page 420.

³ *Polycraticus*, lib. vi., ch. xxiv.

⁴ *Metalogicus*, ch. xlii.

⁵ Baronius, *Annal.* ad an. 1171.

⁶ Benedict XIV. *de canoniz et beatif. SS.*, lib. iv., ch. v., n. 3.

and intellectually one of the most imposing figures of the thirteenth century, and subsequently bishop of Chartres, was the warmest supporter of the Pope's temporal power over States, and was probably the very writer of the petition to Adrian for the Privilege regarding Ireland.

The embassy sent by the King to congratulate the Pope and seek the Privilege consisted of three Continental prelates—the Bishops of Lisieux, of Mans, and of Evreux, together with the Abbot of St. Alban's.¹ The presence of the abbot was not without its influence; Adrian's father had been a monk in St. Alban's for fifty years.² It is not certain whether John of Salisbury accompanied or preceded the embassy; but it appears that he took part in the mission. In the year 1159, on hearing of Adrian's death, after praising the deceased Pope, and deploring his loss, he wrote:—

“At my request he granted to the illustrious King of the English, Henry II., Ireland, to be held by hereditary right, as his letter testifies to this day.⁴ For all the islands by an ancient right are said to belong to the Roman Church in virtue of the Donation of Constantine, who founded and endowed it. He also sent by me a gold ring adorned with an emerald,⁵ whereby there would be an investiture of the right of governing Ireland, and the ring was ordered to be kept henceforth in the public archives.”⁶

¹ “Nuncios solemnnes Romam mittens rogavit Papam Adrianum ut liceret,” &c. Hoveden, *Historia Major*, vol. ii., page 300.

² Abbot Robert was detained by the Pope after the bishops left. The Pope playfully remarked that he was repelled as a postulant at St. Alban's, and the Abbot wittily replied that the will of God could not be opposed. Stephen's *Monasticum Anglicanum*, vol. i., page 248. Newcombe's History, page 65.

³ The Irish princes swore fealty to Henry and his successors (*Chron. Hiberniae*). Even among the Irish the law of Tanistry only modified the law of hereditary succession. Hence Donald O'Neill, in addressing Pope John XXII., styled himself heir to the sovereignty of Ireland. *Scolto-Chron.*, vol. ii., page 281.

⁴ That the phrase to the present day was applied to an interval of a few years, appears from the Gospel of St. Matthew, xxviii. 8-15, and the Acts of the Apostles, xxii. 21-31.

⁵ The use of a ring as a symbol of right did not imply a fief. Innocent III. sent a ring to Richard I., who, however, paid no vassalage. So, too, Zani received the dominion of the Adriatic for Venice from Alexander III. without its being feudatory. The ceremony of annually espousing the Adriatic continued as long as the Republic lasted; and to its discontinuance Byron alludes:—

“The spouseless Adriatic mourns her lord
And annual marriage now no more renewed.”

⁶ *Metologicus*, ch. xlii.

This statement was made at the end of a treatise which was in the hands of the learned in England and on the Continent; it is not absent from a single copy of the *Metalogicus*, and is, therefore, no interpolation. John's statement, made towards the end of 1159, referred to the Privilege which, though not yet made use of, had been obtained in the year 1155. We may remark that John's allusion to the king's hereditary right is justified by the petition for the Privilege, and by the king's pretensions rather than by Adrian's guarded letter of Privilege.

Early reference appears to have been made to Henry's claim to Ireland by the Bishop of Lisieux. On the death of Pope Adrian, several anti-Popes appeared, and Europe was divided by rival parties. Louis of France and Henry of England seemed to lean to the cause of the anti-Pope Victor. Louis, who was son-in-law to the King of Spain, consented to be guided by Henry in bestowing his allegiance. In order to secure their votes, the supporters of Pope Alexander III. granted a dispensation for a marriage between Louis's daughter, aged three years, and Henry's son. This took place at a council held in France in the year 1161. The Italian cardinals blamed the French bishops for granting this dispensation; but, in their justification, the French prelates urged that they thereby secured the votes, not only of Spain and France, but of England and Ireland, not of Scotland. This plea was set forth by Arnulph of Lisieux, a member of the embassy to Pope Adrian.¹

So, too, Peter of Blois, writing to the Bishop of Palermo, on his elevation to the episcopate, stated that Henry had added Ireland to his hereditary dominions.² This letter was written to Walter on his elevation to the archbishopric of Palermo in the year 1170,³ and before Henry went to Ireland.

¹ "De arbitrio regis Anglorum, in momento, Francorum, Anglorum . . . Hiberniae . . . regna cepistis." Watterich, vol. ii., page 511. *Gallia Christiana*, tom. ii., page 357.

² Migne, *Patrologie*, tom. ccvii., page 200-1. Cardinal Moran and other writers seem not to have adverted to this letter, otherwise they would hardly have appealed to the silence of Peter of Blois.

³ Gam, *Series Episcoporum*.

The authenticity of the Privilege of Adrian is more clearly established by the confirmatory Brief of Alexander III. King Henry, by being accessory to the martyrdom of St. Thomas, incurred the displeasure of Pope Alexander, who sent legates to France with a view of placing his dominions under interdict. Henry fled from them, and, accompanied by a formidable army, crossed to Ireland. This act in the circumstances, and the attitude of the Irish in the face of it, furnish arguments in favour of the Privilege of Adrian. On the one hand, this was not a time for Henry to undertake anything that could displease the Pope, and thus aggravate the prejudice against himself; and, on the other hand, vain though any resistance on the part of a weak and divided Irish nation might be, the unresisting attitude of the entire people can hardly be explained apart from any allegation or pretence of right on the part of Henry. An explanation of this general inaction—not a single blow was struck in anger or despair—is found in the Privilege of Adrian, which was made known by John of Salisbury, the Bishop of Lisieux, and Peter of Blois. The Irish princes in person, and the Chief-king by proxy, swore fealty to Henry. He received the submission of the Irish Church by its having, at his bidding, convened a National Council at Cashel for the reformation of morals and discipline. The king, on learning that the Pope's legates were willing to listen to a defence of his conduct in reference to the martyrdom of St. Thomas, after a stay of six months, left Ireland in April, 1172. As a help to his defence, the king sent an account of his proceedings in Ireland to the Pope. His acquittal by the legates at Avranches, in August, and his submission, reinstated him in the favour of Alexander, who, in September following, sent him this confirmatory Brief¹:—

“Alexander, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his most dear son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, greeting and Apostolic benediction.

“Seeing that grants made by our predecessors for valid reasons ought always to be confirmed, and considering the Privilege

¹ One is here reminded of the renewal by Paschal II. to Roger II. of Sicily of the Privilege granted by Urban II. to Roger I.

concerning the Donation of Ireland, which belongs to us, lately given by Adrian, our predecessor, we, following the example of the venerable Pope Adrian, and looking forward to the realization of our own wishes, do hereby confirm the grant of the dominion of Ireland given by him to you, reserving to St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church the annual payment of a penny from each house as well in Ireland as in England; in order that by removing the filthiness of the land, a barbarous nation, which is Christian only in name, may, by your indulgent care, put on grace of manners, and that the disorderly Church of these lands being put in order, the people henceforth may become through you Christian in reality as in name."¹

This confirmatory Brief clearly establishes the Privilege of Adrian. Of the same date as the Brief, 20th September, 1172, we have three letters addressed respectively to the English king, the Irish princes, and the Irish bishops. Some writers who admit "as certainly authentic" the genuineness of these letters, deny the authenticity of Alexander's Brief, but this on no valid grounds.² We may remark that the Privilege of Adrian and Alexander's Brief insist mainly on three points—the right of the Pope to Ireland as an island; the good that would accrue to the Roman Church by Peter pence; and the good that would result to Ireland itself. Those are the prominent points in both documents: what motive can there be for denying, in the face of overwhelming evidence, that one Pope wrote what, admittedly, another substantially adopted? Is not "all the islands on which Christ shone belong to St. Peter and the Roman Church, as your Highness doth acknowledge," in Adrian's letter, identical with that in the admitted letter of Alexander—"your highness is aware that the Roman Church has by right an authority in islands different from that which she possesses over the mainland and continent"?³ Adrian wished that the king should "preserve the rights of the

¹ Giraldus, *Hib. Expugnata*. Chevalier Artaud in his *Lives of the Popes* is mistaken in stating that Alexander repented of having given Ireland to Henry, because of this king's participation in the murder of St. Thomas. Prejudice rather than authority led him, as others, to think that Alexander's grant of Ireland was previous to the martyrdom.

² Cardinal Moran, in *I. E. RECORD*, Nov., 1872.

³ *Liber niger Scaccarii*, fol. 9., ed. by Hearne, vol. i. Rymer's *Fœdera*.

Church in Ireland, and extend its borders by paying out of every house a penny to St. Peter;" and has not this its counterpart in Alexander's letter in "the desire not only to preserve but even to extend the privileges of the Church and St. Peter, as you are bound to do, where she has none"? Pope Adrian expressed a wish that the Irish "should receive and honour King Henry as lord;" so, too, Pope Alexander, in his letter to the Irish princes, was happy to learn "that you received Henry as lord." Does not the mention of "checking the course of crime and eradicating filthiness from the country," found in Adrian's letter, find an echo in the "licentiousness in every course of crime and in the eradication of abominable filthiness," found in the unquestioned letter of Pope Alexander?¹ If Alexander, in his letter, hoped that the "barbarous people without order or law would be brought to order and respect for the divine law," why doubt that he hoped in his Brief "that the barbarous nation would assume gracefulness of morals, and that the disordered Church would be brought into order"? The result proposed in Alexander's letter to the king was "the discipline of the Christian religion and the gain of an everlasting crown of glory." Does not this correspond to Adrian's wish and promise of an "increase of the Christian religion and the reward of everlasting life"? These coincidences, and the allusion to the King's acknowledgment of Alexander's special right over islands in his letter to Henry, clearly prove either that Pope Alexander had before him the Privilege of Adrian, or that the king in applying for a renewal of it, as the original may have lapsed by the death of Adrian, used the very arguments employed for or by him when he asked for the original Privilege.

We would further claim special attention for the following Consistorial decree, made in June, 1558, at the time when Ireland was raised to the dignity of a kingdom. It

¹"Plerumque pervenit ad notitiam apostolicam quod novercae a privigno et duae sorores ab eodem carnaliter cognitae sunt. . . . Novercas suas publice introducunt et ex iis non erubescunt filios procreare: frater uxore fratris eo vivente abutitur, unus duabus sororibus conso-
brinis."—*Liber Scaccarii*.

was subsequently embodied in a Bull, published by Pope Paul IV.:—"Whereas ever since the *dominion of Ireland was obtained from the Apostolic See* by the kings of England, they always had styled themselves only lords of Ireland, till Henry VIII., breaking away from the unity of the Catholic Church and obedience to the Roman Pontiff, usurped the kingly title," &c.¹ This document alone is sufficient to prove the Privilege of Adrian. What reply is made to it by the learned impugnors of the Privilege? Why, this, that Pope Paul IV. wrote only what was suggested to him by Philip and Mary.² Comment is unnecessary.

Adrian's letter of Privilege and Alexander's Brief were read at a Synod at Waterford in the year 1175. On this occasion Henry's authority in ecclesiastical matters was exercised by the appointment of Augustine to the See of Waterford,³ whom he would have consecrated, not by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as had been usual in the case of Waterford bishops, but by the Metropolitan of Cashel. A few years subsequently, in 1188, Gerald Barry published for the world in his *Conquest of Ireland* Adrian's Privilege and Alexander's Brief.⁴ Even had the Privilege not come down to us in its genuine shape, or been established by papal documents, its existence would still be put beyond question by the writers of succeeding generations. From the days of Adrian down to the present time historians have vouched for a Grant from Adrian. We have for this the authority of Giraldus Cambrensis, in the twelfth century; of Brompton, Gervase, Diceto, the Saxon Chronicle, Hoveden, Matthew Paris,⁵ Trivettus, and Wendover in the thirteenth century; of *Leabhar Breac*,⁶ and the testimony of the entire Irish nation, as embodied in the Remonstancé of Donald O'Neill in the fourteenth century; in succeeding ages the authority

¹ *Bullarium Romanum*. Ed. novissima.

² "Tout ce qu'on peut dire, c'est que Paul IV. ou plutôt le compilateur de la bulle transcrivit la requête de Philippe et Marie. Voilà tout." *Analecta*, &c., page 339.

³ Giraldus, *Hib Expugn.*, lib. 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ He was monk of St. Alban's.

⁶ Page 90.

of a "cloud" of witnesses, including Cardinal Pole, who stated that Adrian was influenced by an English bias; and in the seventeenth century the testimony of M'Gheogan, Archbishop Lombard, and of the historian Keating.¹ The testimony of some of these witnesses is the more valuable as it was their interest to deny, if possible, the existence of the Privilege. Thus, the O'Neill of Ulster, in the name of the Irish princes and people, addressing a statement of grievances to Pope John XXII., stated that their grievances were in violation of the terms on which Adrian gave Ireland to Henry. It would have been easier and better to deny the Privilege, had there been none, than complain of the violation of a mythical compact. Pope John did not question the Privilege.¹

On another occasion the Irish nation took a different view of the Privilege, supplying, however, an additional proof of its existence. Instead of demanding a fulfilment of the conditions of the Privilege, the Irish pleaded *Obreption* (false representation) and insisted on the nullity of the Grant. This was made a matter of accusation by the Lord Justiciary, who forwarded the charge to Pope John. The Lord Justiciary, among other charges, accused the Irish of stating that the dominion of Ireland was obtained by false representations and Bulls.³ The accusation was brought by the inhabitants of the Pale against the native Irish: if there had been a shadow of doubt as to the Privilege, would a charge have been founded on it on the one hand, or met by the plea of *Obreption* on the other hand? By and by, when, in the seventeenth century, it was important to find grounds for questioning the Privilege,⁴ the plea of *Obreption* was boldly stated.

¹ "Amore que patriae ductus imperium Hiberniae quae Pontificis donationis fuerat Henrico II. regi concessit." In *Oratione in Comitibus*, Ussher.

² "In apostolicis litteris inde factis clarae memoriae Henrico regi progenitori tuo dominium Yberniae concessit." Theiner, *Vet. Monumenta* ad an. 1318.

³ "Asserentes etiam dominum regem Angliae ex falsa suggestione et ex falsis Bullis terram Hiberniae in dominium impetrasse ac communiter haec tenentes." *Barberini MSS.*

⁴ "Impetratum narrans falsa." O'Sullivan's *Cathol. Hist.*

In a dispute between the Archbishop of Cashel and the English monarch, which was carried before Urban III., the king pleaded precedent in his favour, "ever since the English had come to Ireland by direction of the Apostolic See." The statement, which is only parenthetical, was made in the year 1221, and was addressed to the Pope, who was supposed to have the original Privilege.¹

Allusion to the Privilege mingles with the story of Irish hate and Irish love. At the close of the thirteenth century a dispensation in consanguinity was applied for by two powerful families in Meath. The grounds for application were the furtherance of those ends "for which King Henry, with an army, came to Ireland according to the good-will of the Apostolic See."² The Pope, in granting the dispensation, endorses, by quoting without question, the grounds of the required dispensation.

Let us for a moment revert to Gerald Barry—no man was more competent to speak of the Privilege. He was born about 1150; was tutor to Prince John; accompanied him to Ireland, and was subsequently bishop of St. David's. He published his *Conquest of Ireland*, containing the Privilege, about the year 1188, and dedicated the latest edition of his work, in the year 1202, to his former pupil, King John. Gerald here tells the king that the Conquest was a failure, because the Peter pence, promised in the application for the Privilege, were not paid. He urges on the king that, agreeably to the terms of the Privilege, which is kept in the castle at Winchester, he should pay the Peter pence in order to bring the blessing of God on the Conquest. Is it possible that this appeal could be made to the pocket of grasping King John, if there had been the least doubt of the existence of the Privilege? The Privilege was referred to, not merely as a matter of historical interest, but as bearing on important concerns of daily life.

When kings and pontiffs and an entire nation thus

¹ "Ab eo tempore quo Anglici de mandato Apostolicæ Sedis," *Vet. Monum.*

² "De voluntate sedis Apostolicæ armata manu." Theiner, ad an. 1290.

testify to the Grant of Adrian, it is quite unintelligible how able historical critics can state that the "Irish nation at all times unhesitatingly pronounced it an Anglo-Norman forgery." Such, however, is the statement of Cardinal Moran¹ and Dr. Yungmann.² But this groundless statement is fully met by evidence to the contrary supplied by the cardinal himself. His *Spicilegium Ossoriense* informs us³ that in the year 1605 a petition was presented by the Irish nation for a relaxation of the penal laws, on the ground that the grant of Ireland by Adrian conditioned the preservation of its rights whole and inviolate to the Irish Church, and that a *firm belief* in this compact was shared by every Irish Catholic. The cardinal answers his own objections to the Privilege. Now, furthermore, we make bold to assert that a single pre-Reformation writer cannot be quoted in denial of the Privilege. Subsequently, religious bias, aided by national vanity, suggested doubts. A few writers were found concerned to maintain that the Irish nation was at all times pure and Catholic in practice, and that a Grant founded on an opposite supposition must be a forgery. This conclusion was gratifying to national vanity, and at the same time exonerated the Pope from all responsibility for the Conquest and its ultimate consequences in Church and State.

So overwhelming, however, are the internal evidence and the testimony of witnesses in support of the Privilege, that its few opponents have to fall back on negative proofs of a fanciful character. Thus a Continental writer imagines there was a coolness between the Pope and Henry, because he married Eleanora, the divorced wife of King Louis, and that a Privilege would not on that account be given to Henry.⁴ Why, Eleanora's first marriage was null. and she became conse-

¹ I. E. RECORD, November, 1872, page 62.

² *Dissertationes Selectae*, tom. v., page 228.

³ "Cum omnes fere sint Catholice religionis et professionis etiam persuasum habent titulum quo reges Angliæ dominium in eos acceperunt esse ut ejusdem religionis jura inter ipsos illibata et integra conservent juxta litteras hac de re ab Adriano quarto Pontifici Maximo," &c. Vol. i., page 113.

⁴ *Der Katholik*, 1884, xi., Seite 178-191.

quently free. And if Henry married Eleanora, so did Louis marry a Spanish wife, and yet he obtained the conditional privilege of invading Spain. Again, the alleged silence of the *Regesta* of Jaffé on the Privilege in the nineteenth century has been relied on as a negative proof by Cardinal Moran and others; but the latest editors of the *Regesta* have pronounced as genuine both Adrian's letter¹ and Alexander's confirmatory Brief.

Let us, in conclusion, notice that against the overwhelming mass of evidence in proof of our contention, is advanced only the unsupported assertion that the Privilege was forged for the purpose of keeping the rebellious Irish quiet at some unspecified time after the year 1188.² Of what use could such a document be when there existed in 1172 the real letters of Alexander commissioning the Irish bishops to help Henry in keeping Ireland subject to him? Whence the necessity of a forged document after 1188, as the original was read in 1175, on occasion of the consecrating of the Bishop of Waterford? Was not the papal mind clearly expressed when, in 1177, Cardinal Vivian would have those excommunicated who opposed the authority of Henry, and when, in 1185, Urban III. sent a legate to crown John King of Ireland?

If it is admitted that Pope Alexander's letter enjoined on the Irish bishops the duty of helping Henry "in keeping possession of Ireland, acquired under the inspiration of God," why not more readily admit, on overwhelming evidence, his Brief of the same date, which merely "confirms to him the dominion of Ireland"? And if we admit the Brief, the genuineness of Adrian's Privilege necessarily follows. The evidence in its support consists of the historical testimony of the most approved kind. The very last of these, furnished in the sixteenth century, would of itself be sufficient for our purpose. The statement in the Bull of Pope Paul IV.—"the kings of England obtained the dominion of Ireland

¹ Jaffé, Lipsiæ, 1886, fasc. nonus, n. 10056, et Fasc. Undecimus, page 263, no. 12174.

² *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, l. cit., page 310.

from the Apostolic See"¹—is of itself an unanswerable argument. For this and the further reasons we have set forth there does not appear to us in the domain of history a better authenticated fact than the Privilege of Adrian IV. to Henry II.

SYLVESTER MALONE.

FROM FOREST TO FIELD.

I.

TIS a mellow afternoon in June. The western sun is gilding the green ivy leaves that shyly peep around the corner of the squared-stone window-sill above my desk. An Australian magpie is warbling its sweet flute-like *scherzetto* on the decayed branch of a gum-tree overhead, and among the shrubs and hedges underneath the sparrows nag and quarrel, scattering their sharp, fretful notes on the calm air. Below and round about lies our town, a rising inland centre of Western Victoria. It is a typical Australian provincial town, planned and built to suit the needs of a new land where forests abound and man has "room and verge enough" for all his enterprise. Timber is the prime favourite as a building material; brick comes in a bad second; squared stone treads hard on the heels of brick; and the homely corrugated iron roof shelters the great bulk of its population from the glow of the summer sun and the pelting of the winter rain. The houses are for the most part of the severely modern and utilitarian form known as "square boxes with windows in them." They are ranged in blocks almost as regular as the squares on your chess-board, along streets running in two sets of parallel lines, that cross each other at right angles, like the stripes of colour in a Scotch tartan. To European eyes our town wears a stiff, brand new look, as though it had grown up in the silent

¹ *Bullarium Romanum.*

watches of yesternight under the deft hand of some southern Goban Seor. There is no "rime of age" upon it; none of the subtle halo that history, legend, and fable have thrown round many a quiet hamlet in far-off Wexford. No haunted gray ruin of keep or abbey stands guard above it; no belt of mouldering wall tightlaces its growing population within the limits of a village green. Young Australia will have elbow-room or death. The very sheep and cattle roam through paddocks of hundreds or thousands of acres in extent; the main country roads measure sixty-six yards from fence to fence; and the streets of her cities and towns are broad and sunny and airy. The pulsing heart of this inland centre lies on the flat below me, among the shops and offices and banks and all the other tools and tricks of Mammon. Three low, round-backed hills look down on the busy flat. They are rivals for the pride of place and fashion and general respectability. Up their sunny slopes lie the neat gardens and the pretty verandaed houses of brick and stone, where live our local wealth and rank, and, generally, "everybody that is anybody" in this proud and flourishing little town. On the crown of the slopes stand the "show" buildings of the place: the three principal churches, the colleges, and the big district hospital, on whose long high-pitched roofs spire-lets and pinnacles and finials bristle like quills upon the fretful porcupine.

Beyond the last straggling houses and narrowing gardens of the town a fair soft landscape lies mellow in the sun. Far away the even level of the circling horizon is broken on the east and south by the blue cones of two extinct volcanoes. Northwards rise the tall peaks of the Serra and Victoria Ranges, jaggling the sky-line like the teeth of a dissipated saw. Just beyond the horizon-line—some sixteen to twenty-two miles away—four townships "set" around us—as the moons around Jupiter. Between us and our satellites 'tis all a plain: not the dead level of Kildare and Meath, but a surface of wavy lines rising and dipping as softly as the long foamless swell that pulses in the fair summer time beyond the rock-bound shores of Kilkee.

This rolling plain is far gone in the toilsome process of

evolution from forest to field. Some of the old wild look hangs round it even now; some of the old wild nature still lingers in its bosom. Take away the restraint of man's presence—of axe, and fire, and plough, and flock—and in two short decades yon rich pastoral plains would be a green-tangled wilderness, as they were in 1836, when Mitchell first explored these fertile western wilds. Over the billowy miles still grows the eucalyptus, Australia's principal tree. "Gum-tree" is the inapt generic title given to it a century ago by the first Australian colonists, who had a curious, though pardonable propensity for bestowing inappropriate names on the strange flora and fauna of this new southern land. In vain did botanists and zoologists introduce in later days a nomenclature of resounding Greek and Latin, and suggest suitable designations in the vulgar tongue. The old names were already household words. The hilarious Great Kingfisher (*Dacelo gigas*) still remains a "laughing-jackass;" the flute-voiced piping crow shrike (*Gmnorhina tibicen*), a "magpie;" the peaceful leaf-eating koala (*phascolarctus*), a "native bear;" the vulpine phalangist an "opossum;"¹ and to colonists, learned and unlearned alike, the eucalyptus is colloquially now and for evermore a "gum-tree." Here and there on the plains before me the eucalyptus still grow in thick belts and patches of many hundreds of acres. Over many a stretching mile to the south giant stragglers stand defiantly above their fallen mates of the forest, or support their wounded comrades, as the brave Dalgaiss did long ago on the plains of Ossory. But for the most part the plains have lost their tree-growth in great bald patches, that keep ever-spreading, spreading, where forty years ago nature's warm forest-tresses were thick as the locks of Absalom. 'Tis June, the mild southern winter has set in,² and the eucalyptus meet

¹ One of the most common of the Australian mammals measuring about two feet six inches from snout to tip of tail. It lives principally on the leaves and fruit of the gum-tree, and is nocturnal in its habits. Its fur, which is very much prized, is exported in large quantities to Europe. Not to be confounded with the American opossum, which belongs to the *Entomophaga*.

² In this part of Victoria the winter is very mild. Frosts are light, and snow is very rarely seen except on the mountain ranges. The ordinary noon-day summer heat in Victoria ranges from 85° to 104° F. in the shade. During the prevalence of heat-waves and hot winds, the

the growing cold by wrapping their bony forms in a thickening frieze-like coat of bark. When October brings the breath of summer back again they will peel off their rough overcoat in long strips, and cast it to the winds; but through all the cycle of the seasons they retain the scant head-dress of horny falcate leaves, which (being set on with vertical plane) give but a thin, speckled shade to the stock through the long hot days from December to March. Some dyspeptic European has nicknamed the gum-trees the "scarecrows of Australia." It is true that many species of them lack the sweeping lines and the masses of light and shade that Constable and Turner loved; yet, patriotic young Australia finds them fairer than the imported oak and lime and elm, that litter the streets and garden paths with fallen autumn leaves, and stand naked and shelterless when the keen wind from the northern deserts moans and whimpers across the plains. Scarecrows! 'Tis too sweeping an epithet to fling at more than a hundred and fifty different species of *myrtaceae*, that present such endless varieties of form and height and density. There are gum-trees as rugged and spreading as your tree-king, the oak; slim and graceful as the ash, the "lady" of your northern forests; drooping as the willow; densely clad as the elm, and raw-boned as a windmill. You will find them soft and fissile as a Scotch fir, and so hard as to turn the edge of an axe, and withstand a triple alliance of white ant, teredo, and chelura. They range in height from the dwarf mallee-scrub (*Eucalyptus dumosa*) to the mast-like *Euc. amygdalina* (var. *Regnans*) of Gippsland in Eastern Victoria, the Saul of forest trees, the tallest vegetable-growth on the surface of the earth. Some of these noble trees are said to be over five hundred feet in height. One colossal specimen still standing measures four hundred and seventy-one feet; another, felled on the

extremes of heat *in the shade* for various years and various parts of the colony have been 103°, 104°, 107°, 110°, 111°, 114°, 116°, 117°.4, 120° (Stawell). In the heat-wave of the summer 1889-90 (described in I. E. RECORD, vol. xi., No. 8), the maximum heat *in the sun* reached 176½ degrees F. (176°.5). The summer heat in Victoria is dry, and though uncomfortable and enervating when it reaches *extremes*, is perfectly bearable. The above figures have been supplied by the Government Observatory, Melbourne.

Black Spur, measured four hundred and eighty feet,¹ being thirty-two feet higher than the top of the cross on the dome of St. Peter's in Rome, and out-topping by thirty feet the loftiest of the famed mammoth trees of Calaveros Grove in California.

Many other interesting specimens of Australian trees dot the plains among the prevailing growth of eucalyptus. In the poorer soil are patches of the dark-green, showy-flowered native honeysuckle (*Banksia integrifolia*); clumpy, graceful blackwoods (*Acacia melanoxylon*); and here and there plantations of dark-trunked, phyllode-leaved wattles (*Acacia*, various), which supply the best tan-bark that has ever turned rawhide to leather.² There are also plentiful clusters of the dark, leafless sheoak (which is not an oak, but a *casuarina*), a weird, sad-looking tree, covered with long, hair-like filaments, which, at the softest touch of the zephyr, set up a low crooning, dismal as the night-wail of the banshee.

II.

This mingled scene of forest and field is a pleasant change for eyes that long have looked on the face of the goldfields, with their cradles and windlasses, their tall chimneys and poppet heads, the ceaseless rumble of their quartz-crushing batteries, and their great eruptive patches of gray and yellow mullock thrown out of the bowels of the earth by the burrowing gold-bug man. Here in the West the gold fields have never "broken out." There are no "indications," no "washdirt," no payable gold-bearing quartz. But the wealth lies on the surface, after all. It lies in the fat soil, in the deep grass, in the countless "mobs"³ of sheep, whose silky fleeces find their way to the world's great marts when shearing time is over—each October and November. For Western Victoria is a rich, fair land. Its

¹ Baron von Mueller, *Select Extra-tropical Plants*, page 145; Wall, *Physical Geography of Australia*, page 127.

² One and a-half pounds of wattle bark do the work of about five pounds of English oak. (Bonwick, *Australia*, page 61.)

³ "Mob" is almost the only noun of multitude used by the average colonial in speaking of the brute creation.

first explorer (Mitchell) styled it "Australia Felix" long before a divided hoof ever trod its forest glades.¹ The sweet-sounding name is now forgotten or disused, but it still stood on certain yellow maps some twenty years ago, when "a man severe and stern to view" led my classmates by purgatorial paths through the calculations of Gough and the rules of Lindley Murray.

"Way back in the forties" began the real work of settling this portion of the West Victorian bush. The first squatter and his "hands" moved slowly and cautiously hitherward in 1838, past hostile tribes of blacks, depasturing his stock through the trackless forest. His tools and stores were in a dray, drawn by a long team—or rather a chain gang—of bullocks. For the patient steer is a forest pioneer. You meet him where the woods are pathless, and the tracks are deep in mud, and a long, strong pull is needed. Time has not dealt kindly by the placid steer. Ages ago he fed in toilless peace by Scamander's yellow tide, and Homer sang his great soft eyes into the halls of high Olympus. His eyes are soft and dreamy still, I ween; but fashion has changed. Steer eyes have "gone out:" the fickle Western has long ago flung them into the lumber room of discarded poetic fancies, while the more conservative celestial clings for ever to almond eyes; the faithful Persian still sings the eyes of Ali; and down a long perspective of centuries the constant Kalmuk has seen all the beauties of nature in the brown orbits of his fat-tailed sheep. There is neither poetry nor romance in the life of the working steer in this new land. His neck still bears a barbarous, ill-constructed yoke, that has known no change since the days of Sethi and Rameses. His back and ribs are scored and cross-hatched by the long rawhide lash of the "bullochy," whose roulades of deep profanity were among the first "civilised" sounds that woke the forest echoes of Western Victoria.

The early squatter "trekked" these trackless wilds in

¹ There are no hoofed animals indigenous to Australia. The only indigenous mammals (besides the dingo or wild dog) are the marsupials, a few bats, rats, and mice. (Lunholtz, *Among Cannibals*, page 378.)

search of a good run for his stock: to wit, plenty of grass, and, if possible, a constant natural supply of water. When he struck "good country" he took out a grazing license for perhaps some fifty thousand acres, from which no white man could dispossess him, divided his stock over the run in charge of shepherds or stockmen,¹ and fenced off a stockyard and a horse paddock. He slept under such cover as the body of his dray afforded, or in a sod hut, or bark *gunyah*, till his run began to prosper. Then he built a "regular" hut. It had a formidable chimney of rough stone; tall tussock grass covered the roof; the walls were upright slabs split from the gum-tree, and plentifully loopholed for the benefit of the unfriendly cannibals that flitted about upon the run.

Usually there was a lack of water in the long hot summer days: for Australia is a thirsty land compared with "green Eire of the streams;" the rivers in this great island-continent are few and far apart, and for the most part owe their flow to the rain clouds. The smaller rivers and creeks (watercourses) trip merrily down their beds when mountain and plain are sodden with the winter rains; but November, with its rising mercury and lengthening day, puts a brake on their rapid run. They creep, crawl, stop. The remnant of their waters shrink into hidden bends and quiet nooks, where they sleep under the lichened rocks and the drooping redgums till the cool breath of winter wakes them once more.

Away underground, beneath the rocks and the roots of the gum-trees, lies the great riverland of Australia. There the brooks go on for ever, and the rivers flow, dark as the tide of Lethe, down rocky narrow beds, and through caverns such as we read of in the scientific dreams of Verne. Not more precious to Australia are its gold-bearing reefs of quartz than are these sunless streams. Of late years diamond drills are ever tapping them, artesian wells are drawing them up, and their liberated tide is creating many a Tadmor in many a waterless Australian waste. But in the distant "forties"

¹ One shepherd could manage 1,000 to 1,500 sheep; a stockman, with the aid of a boy, could manage up to 4,000 head of cattle. (Boldrewood, *Old Melbourne Memories*.)

the underground rivers were unknown or undisturbed. The squatter in these Western plains had to stand or fall by the winter flow of creek or river, artificial dams, or the supply in the stagnant, reed-grown swamp. In summer the pools in the creek or river bed were frequently brackish. The water in the swamp fell as the thermometer rose, and often became a *soupe maigre*—a thick decoction of decayed reeds and algae. To the parched throats of sheep and cattle the saline pools were a good “stand by;” the muddy lees of the swamp sweet as the sparkling wave of Arethusa. From the same dark source their owner and his “hands” drew deep draughts of the bushman’s indispensable drink—milkless “billycan” tea (for the days had not yet come when corrugated iron tanks caught the sweet rain water from the roof of his verandahed cottage). Boiling killed the bacteria and partly precipitated the sediment; brown sugar disguised the potent flavour of decayed marshweed; toil and hunger and thirst gave a Spartan relish to the squeamish “black broth,” and made it sweet as Souchong brewed in distilled water and served up in old Nankin. The Australian bushman was no more a Baron Brisse than his cousin the backwoodsman of America. His bill of fare was:—Tea, mutton, and damper; damper, mutton, and tea (with rare variations) every meal of the day, every day of the week, every week of the year.¹ Once or twice a year there came a change in his *menu*—when the want of stores or the sale of a “draft” of sheep or cattle or of his year’s “clip” sent him to Portland, or Geelong, or far-off Melbourne; then he tasted “dishes.” Perhaps he was what the old toast refrain calls a “right good fellow,” whose convivial spirit was kept under hatches during weary years of exile in the bush. In that case he probably “sampled” divers “noblers” of “tanglefoot” (ominous name!) or “longsleevers” of colonial beer, or invited all and sundry to “name their pizen” at the bar of the “Magpie and the Kangaroo.” These were the worst escapades of our Western pioneers. They were not given to

¹ On cattle stations beef took the place of mutton in the above bill of fare. “Damper” is flour worked into dough with water and baked with embers.

promiscuous revolver practice or bowie knife drill, or to any of those gay and festive pranks which (if we can rely on certain humorous writers) constitute what is termed out west in America "raising Cain." They were, as a rule, peaceful, thrifty citizens, many of them gentlemen by birth and education. Their long years of trial and privation and exposure in the bush were a stern self-discipline that taught them, as a body, to bear themselves with the dignity of nation makers.

III.

"Clearing" was not undertaken on a large scale by the early settlers till later years, when the runs, which they had previously rented from the Government, became their own by purchase. The thick bush and scrub encumbered the ground, and kept the full sunlight from the herbage that the sheep and cattle needed; and so the squatter and his men girded their loins to the slow but winning toil of forest taming. They set the firebrand to the dead and dry and hollow timber. The mounting flames routed the marsupial bear and the opossum from their lairs, and turned the great trunks to ashes. Felling was resorted to where the timber was thick and green. 'Twas "sweaty work," as Hamlet saith—grim, long-drawn toil, that turned a few thousand acres of forest into field only when the toiler's hand had grown less cunning and his hair and beard were tinged with gray. For many a year the axe strokes rang through the forest like the blows of fate or the pulse of time, felling the thick growths, clearing the scrub where the dingo howled and the marsupial cat watched for its prey. Miles of forest became miles of stumps, to be destroyed by fire or decay, or dragged from the earth's embrace by bullock teams, or forced out, like curious molars, by the strong levers of the stump extractor. On the opener forest ground "ringbarking" gave the earth all the air and light it needed. A band or ring of bark is cut away round the trunk of the tree some two feet above the ground; the tree dies, the bark peels off in strips, the leaves fall, and over thousands of acres to-day the trunks stand naked and ghastly—a spectre forest—

waving their white arms in the breeze, like the ghosts of murdered Banquos, shaking curses on the air.

In the early forties very little clearing was done here, and the flocks and herds were watched by shepherds and stockmen in the glades of the virgin forest. Flock-tending in the West in those times was not the idyllic pursuit it was in the days when Ramsay's gentle shepherd carried his crook and played rippling little pastorals upon a pipe. The bush-shepherd's only pipe was a plain but precious "clay," black and odorous; his crook, a rifle or shot-gun; for the squatter and his men had "sat down" in the heart of a hostile country, on the hunting-grounds of the Australian black.¹ They were face to face with a mysterious race, full of the strange contrasts and surprises which are so frequent in the fauna and flora and climate of this southern land. Many ethnologists give the Australian aborigines the lowest place in the mental plane of all the children of Adam. Possibly they are not far wrong. The "black fellows" have no history, no legends, no social or political organisation, no knowledge of agriculture. In their "native" condition they are divided up into countless small tribes, numbering from a hundred to a few hundred souls, each tribe roaming within its ancestral hunting-grounds, now at peace, now at war, always living, like the hunted stag, in hourly dread of ambush and attack. They have, as a rule, no hereditary chieftaincy. The leadership of a tribe is decided, as among the wild prairie herd, by hardness of head and sheer brute force. They are polygamous and cannibals, and will feast not only on the flesh of their fallen foe, but without the stress of hunger frequently devour the bodies of their own murdered children. Before the coming of the white man they knew no metal. A homeless race: they camp where game is most abundant, and pass the summer and the winter nights in wretched little open *mia-mias*, or shelters of boughs, twigs, bark, grass, &c. They have no yesterday and no to-morrow, living for the

¹ Full and very interesting information about the Australian blacks may be had from Dawson's *Australian Aborigines*, Carr's *Australian Race*, Beveridge's *Aborigines of Victoria and Riverina*, and Lumholtz's recent work, *Among Cannibals*.

passing hour. To-day their chase has been a "a run of luck," and they gorge themselves with wild honey from the hollow trees, broiled snake, wild ducks or geese, killed with the boomerang as they rose from the swamp, roast opossum, haunch of wallaby, and tail of kangaroo. All is religiously devoured at one sitting. To-morrow and the next day they will subsist on short commons, or bear the pangs of hunger with the fortitude of Stoics. None of their many languages contain words to express abstract ideas or numerals beyond five. Some few tribes are said to have no notion of a Deity or of any spiritual being. The religion of others is summed up in a wild, vague fear of Bunyip, their "devil-devil"—a hideous monster that haunts the reedy depths of some dismal swamp. On the other hand, tribes have been found in New South Wales with fairly well-defined religious notions. It is even said that some of them held a doctrine of the Trinity bearing a striking resemblance to that of the Christian religion.¹ In various colonies they have been found amenable, especially if taken young, to the instructions of Catholic missionaries—the only white men who have ever taken a successful practical interest in the eternal lot of those dark-skinned forest children.

Mentally the "black fellow" is supposed to be at the foot of the human ladder. Yet at school his children are said to absorb learning more quickly than the offspring of the white man. In knowledge of woodcraft he far surpasses the noble red man. His senses of sight, hearing, and smell, are developed to an extent that to us seems almost preternatural. This strange faculty of the native tribes is turned to good account by the governments of all the Australian colonies, who employ numbers of black trackers that follow up the trail of criminals, stolen cattle, &c., where the keen eyes of a javert could detect no clue, nor the best trained bloodhound find a scent. This extraordinary development of the hunting sense is, perhaps, not to be wondered at in a savage race that for centuries found itself compelled to provide its daily food

¹ *Lumholtz, Among Cannibals*, pages 129, 183; *Transactions of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, 1882.

with defective weapons. Never was Sioux or Iroquois so consummate a stalker as the Australian black. His trail is faultless as a sleuthhound's, his footfall velvety as that of your fireside tabby, and for some fifty yards his spear goes true to its mark as Boer bullet or Littlejohn arrow. He has never come so near civilisation as to invent or possess a bow, and yet his strange, elbow-shaped weapon, the boomerang—which, like Thor's hammer, has the faculty of returning to its thrower—is a curiosity and puzzle to the scientific world.¹

The advent of the squatter generally led to strained relations with these dusky forest braves. He violated frontier and disturbed vested rights when he "sat down" on the black man's hunting-grounds. He and his few "hands" were scattered over many miles of run, circled round about by relatively numerous enemies, gifted with a strategy and cunning that made their spear, nulla-nulla (club), and war boomerang well-nigh a match for the rifle and revolver of the white man. Their stealthy attacks and clever descents on the folds compelled some of the first squatters in this district to give up run after run. In time the steady advent of other colonists to these grassy plains gave the scattered whites a feeling of power and security. Still, the "black question" long remained a difficult and delicate one. The more humane and sensible whites—and they were the immense majority—adopted a policy of conciliation, cautiously cultivated the good-will of the black man, and paid occasional tribute to their local "King Billy" and his braves in flour, sugar, tea, "backy," kitchen refuse and old hats. In return for these advantages his majesty and his majesty's men were supposed to respect the shepherds and spare the flocks. But

¹ This surprising weapon, the boomerang, can be thrown over two hundred yards, and returns, whirling on its axis, with amazing velocity to its owner. It can kill or severely injure an enemy or quarry concealed behind a tree, out of reach of spear, and commits great havoc among a flight of wild-fowl rising from the water. A vice-president of the Royal Society said that "its path through the air would puzzle a mathematician." Sir Thomas Mitchell, the explorer, adapted its principle to the propulsion of ships, and *The Times*, September 29th, 1852, tells how the "Boomerang Propeller" attained a speed of twelve knots an hour against a head wind. The war boomerang is non-returning.

the black man's friendship was slippery and uncertain ; his native character was fickle ; his childish heart "hankered arter" the squatter's sweet sugar cask ; his eye was dazzled by the sheen of the European axe and tomahawk ; his teeth watered for the "white man's meat" that grazed and chewed the cud under the tall gum-trees. All these varied treasures were guarded by only three or four scattered strangers, and one bold stroke would win them all. And again : was not his wild anger roused at times by the outrages and vices of the rougher station "hands," many of whom were old "lags" from the convict settlements of Van Diemen's Land ; so there was often "trouble" on the run. Steers were missing, sheep left without warning, open attacks were made on the white man by day, shepherds or hut-keepers were speared on distant parts of the run. One morning some fourteen hundred sheep (value then about £2 each¹) had disappeared. An armed search party came upon the blacks feasting on mutton in a grassy hollow. The missing flock lay near the camp fires, *their fore-legs broken*, so that they should not stray away before the long feast of "white man's meat," was ended. On another occasion the hind legs of the missing flock were dislocated for the same purpose and with the same result.

In circumstances of this kind even the friendly squatter was tempted to adopt for a time the tactics of the less numerous and rougher school of colonists whose motto ran : "the only way to civilize the black fellow is to civilize him off the face of the earth." And so for years the gruesome story ran. White men and black dropped into a vicious circle of outrage, cattle-spearing, black-shooting, shepherd slaying, mutual distrust and racial hate. Contact with English-speaking peoples wrought the Australian race the same ruin that it has brought, or is bringing, upon every savage people that has come under their sway : a sharp and painful contrast to the christianizing and conservative influences which Spain and other Catholic nations have

¹ At the present day the value of a sheep ranges from about eight to twelve shillings.

exercised on the aborigines of Central and South America.¹ Even in the cases where the Australian blacks received and returned the unvarying friendship of the white man, their ruin was no less certain. With a strange fatality for copying the worst features of civilized life, they delivered themselves over to a frantic love for fiery drinks and white men's vices, which in a few years wrought woeful havoc in the numbers and splendid physique of the Victorian tribesmen. To-day they are a doomed and hopeless race. A fast-decaying remnant of some five hundred now remain (many of them half-castes) living in six stations or aboriginal reserves established and managed by the Victorian Government. In a few years more some lone survivor of the Victorian blacks will follow to the grave the last of his Tasmanian brethren, who died in 1872. In all the other colonies drink, disease, and other causes are at work degrading and killing off the black man, and it is only a question of time when the only relics of this strange and interesting people will be the skeletons and arms that line the museums of Europe and Australia.

IV.

The gradual disappearance of the black man did not end the squatter's troubles. The dingo, or waragal dog, still remained: he is a true wild dog, reddish-brown in colour, almost as tall and powerful as the wolf, timid and cunning as the fox, and given to hunt his game in packs. Like the black tribes, each pack of dingos is said to have a traditional hunting-ground,² beyond which they never roam, and which they preserve from invasion by neighbouring packs as jealously as the aboriginal tribesman guards the little tract of territory which the custom of centuries has made his home. Before the coming of the white man the dingo had breakfasted, dined, and supped principally on the brownish-red,

¹ In Mexico, after centuries of Spanish occupation, 45 per cent. of the population are of purely aboriginal descent, only 19 per cent. are of purely European stock, the remaining 36 per cent. being of mixed race. (*Revista Contemporanea*, 15th March, 1891. See also, *Cinq Années de Séjour aux Iles Canaries*, par Verneau, Paris, 1891).

² Wall, *Physical Geography of Australia*, page 145.

hare-like flesh of the kangaroo. The settler's flock brought a welcome change in his traditional bill of fare: for even a dingo relishes a little variety in his board. Beside, the Lincoln and Merino were more easily captured than the fleet-bounding marsupial, and yielded a better return of juicy flesh. Sheep-hunting, so to speak, shortened the dingo's hours of labour, and at the same time gave him an increase of what economists call his real wages. So they flung themselves in packs upon the flocks, and delivered themselves up to the savage instinct which they have in common with their cousin the fox, of slaying more than their hunger needed. Armed shepherds had to watch the sheep by day; at night they were enclosed in hurdle pens and guarded, while outside the bright eyes of the dingos glittered in the dark, and their dismal yelpings filled the air. Shot and bullets somewhat thinned their ranks. In the end poisoned carcasses of sheep left their handsome bodies strewn in scores over the runs, and so reduced their numbers that at present only a timid few are to be found within many a league from where I write.

The dingo and the black man were the natural enemies of the kangaroo tribe. For centuries they had exacted a tribute of prey that kept the numbers of these marsupials within moderate bounds. Now spear and fang called for victims no more. Kangaroos and wallaby multiplied beyond measure and swarmed in thousands on these Western plains where the grass was softest and sweetest: for in the matter of herbage the kangaroo is as fine a *gourmet* as is Brillat-Savarin in wines and meats. They "ate the paddocks down," and in the summer days the sheep went lank and hungry over the closely-cropped runs, or lay down to die like the sick hart whose forage had been devoured by his sympathetic forest visitors. Squatters saw that their runs could not support two "mobs," and uttered their fierce *delenda est*—the kangaroo must go. They "laid the varmint out" with shot and ball. They ran them down with stock-dogs and greyhounds: it was sport for kings, as their quarry bounded away through the gum-tree forest and over the rough log fences; but it was decidedly too slow. Something

wholesale was needed to wipe the noxious marsupials off the face of the earth. Those were not the days of Nordenfelt and Maxim guns ; but kangaroo battues served their purpose quite as well. A large yard was made, with log walls some twelve feet high. From its entrance two tall log or brushwood fences ran out for perhaps two miles, splaying rapidly like the arms of a mighty V, whose opening (which was one and a-half or two miles across) faced the favourite feeding-ground of the kangaroos. On a fixed day "all the neighbours" from forty miles around came, mounted on their hardy, unshod, bush horses, and a grand battue began, surpassing in excitement the historic outings of Epping and Fontainebleau. Riders, beaters, gunsmen, and dogs, went far afield (under the direction of "captains," chosen for their knowledge of the run), and gradually encircled the feeding mob with a living line, each end of which rested on or near a leg of the V-shaped fence. The line closed in and in, driving the kangaroos into the treacherous embrace of the arms of the "race" (the narrowing, fenced-in space), down which the frightened creatures hopped until they found themselves bewildered and imprisoned within the high strong walls of the yard. A wild rush of men, horses, and dogs followed the last of the trapped kangaroos. The entrance to the yard was secured ; the riders "hung up" their horses ; and all hands, armed with clubs, entered the yard and began a woeful slaughter. As many as three thousand two hundred kangaroos of various kinds have been destroyed on one day in a single "drive" on a station not many miles from where I write : wallabies from eighteen to twenty-four inches or more in height, brush kangaroos, two to four feet high, "old men" or "foresters" five and a-half to seven and a-half feet high—formidable fellows, strong enough to carry a man bodily away in their fore "arms."¹ The third toe of their hind legs is armed with a long, sharp nail, used by the male with terrific effect when brought to bay, and capable of ripping up dog or man like the point of a sabre. The carcasses of the slain were left to fester and taint the air : too full a

¹*Among Cannibals*, page 328.

feast for even the omnivorous Australian crows, that dropped like great soot-flakes from the sky when the battue had scarce begun.¹

The "drives" speedily thinned out the kangaroos from the open plains of this district. They are numerous still in the safe retreats of forest, scrub, and mountain range, and generally on all the less thickly-populated grasslands over the whole continent. They are the principal type of its fauna, as the gum-tree is of its flora, and have come to be the recognised national emblem of Australia. In these days of museums, zoological gardens, popularized science and general education, every school child is familiar with the form of the kangaroo; but in the early days of these colonies the first sight of the great uncouth "forester" in his native wilds filled the unsophisticated "newchum" with feelings of dismay. In 1771 Captain Cook's sailors came back to him in white-faced terror, declaring that they had seen the very demon himself hopping away into the forest on his two hind legs. Many years ago a newly-imported Scotch shepherd burst precipitately into the men's hut on a station in this mission, barred the door behind him, and in quavering accents told his assembled "mates" of a fearful something he had seen, which "gaed hap, hap; it was na a coo, it was na a horse, but it had a tail verra like the deevil's."

To-day the kangaroo is lord of the run no longer. The worst enemies of the squatter's flocks and herds are now disease, the bush fires that yearly burn up tens of thousands of acres of precious grass, and the rabbits, that have come to be a devouring plague, which neither trapping, shooting, poisoning, smothering, digging out, "driving," legislation, nor the most drastic resources of science and civilisation have succeeded in evicting from their home in Australian soil. In this colony droughts are rare and of short duration. Among our neighbours they are more frequent, and sometimes last through two or three years—long-drawn agonies

¹ In Queensland the kangaroo has become a noxious animal, and the Government has put a price upon its head. This premium system reduced the number of these marsupials by six millions in the years 1880-'85. (*Among Cannibals*, page 380.)

that eat up the toil and profits of years, and leave vast areas dotted over with the walking skeletons and festering carcasses of sheep and cattle. Starving lots of sheep have been sold at sixpence per head, and an instance is cited by Comettant in which a flock changed hands at the rate of a penny each.¹ Here in Western Victoria there is just enough of shadow in the squatter's life to remind him that Arcady the Blest is lost for ever. Many of our pioneers are with us still—grizzled old veterans who felled the forest and made the field, and saw the towns spring up and grow upon the plains. The first white woman that settled in this colony still lives not many blocks away, hale and happy and seventy-four. Out on the rolling plains the *gunyas* and slab huts, that sheltered the squatter in the "forties" have grown into fine "stations," with their gardens, stores, offices, and great woolsheds, in each of which ten thousand to a hundred thousand sheep lose their soft fleeces when November brings the long southern summer days. Round about the station lie its tens of thousands of grassy acres, divided into great paddocks by post and rail or wire fences, which have replaced the log and brush and "dog leg" obstacles of former days. The green plains are cut up—like towns on a big scale—into great blocks of many square miles, and allotments of a few hundred acres. These are bounded by a loose woof and warp of broad roads, crossing each other at right-angles, and looking on the map like the threads of a coarse strainer. Over this network of roads the railway lines run as they list, past the rising towns that stand on the old hunting-grounds where the blackman's footfall is heard no more. And half a generation has done it all.

This is, roughly, the story of how some four thousand square miles of Western Victoria were evolved from wood to field. It is more or less the history of forest-taming in every part of the Australian continent.

H. W. CLEARY.

¹ *Au Pays des Kangourous*, page 104.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PASSION, FROM LITERATURE AND THE DRAMA.

1. THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD : A LIFE OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. By the Abbé Constant Fouard. Translated by G. F. X. Griffith. In two Volumes. London : Longman, 1891.
2. THE PASSION-PLAY, AS IT IS PLAYED TO-DAY AT OBER-AMMERGAU, IN 1890. By William Stead. London : Mowbray House, 1890.

THE nineteenth century, amongst much for which it is responsible in causing indifference, if not positive hostility, to the facts and truths of our holy religion, deserves credit also for much which is conducive to Christian instruction, edification, and piety. In two different ways, and by two different means, the average Christian may be influenced by the effects of our composite civilization, in the latter direction, for his good. These ways and means consist—first, in the results obtained by critical science and discovery ; and secondly, in the application of such research and science, either in the printed pages of a theological treatise, or histrionically on the stage, in sacred drama. If to these two claims upon our gratitude be added the material aids, not only for securing, but also for utilizing and distributing these elements of sacred knowledge, which are open to the Church of to-day, the modern spirit of the nineteenth century will not appear so wholly anti-Catholic as it proves itself to be under other conditions.

Perhaps in no former century could a volume comparable to the Abbé Fouard's *Life of Christ* be made, within its own limits, so all-embracing and exhaustive. Certainly, never before has the *Passion-Play* at Ober-Ammergau been enacted with such elaborate modern appliances for effectiveness. The work of the Abbé is by no means the first of the lives of our Lord drawn upon similar, though not on the same, lines of construction. The drama of Joseph Mayer and his fellow actors is almost, if not quite, the last indirect descendant of

the ancient moralities and mysteries of the Middle Age. But, they both owe untold obligations to the intellectual activity and to the physical developments of the present day. The dramatic performance could not have been produced with all the perfection of modern art, taste, and skill; could not have been subjected to world-wide criticism (which presupposes an equal range of influence); could not have been presented to such cosmopolitan audiences, in a former century. The fruits of Abbé Fouard's historical and biographical labours—written in France, translated in America, published in England, and read wheresoever the two great languages are spoken—two-thirds of whose quoted works, and one-half of whose quoted authors, date from the present century—could hardly have been made so complete, and have become so easily accessible, apart from the adventitious aid of the printing-press, the steam-engine, and the post-office.

Both the drama and the volume treat of one subject—the first entirely, and the last partially—the story which has transformed the world. Each may be approached from a different side, and each may be made to minister to a different aspect of the same great historical event, or series of events. In the play of the Ammergau peasants we may see reproduced, by living actors, the fourfold Gospel story of the Passion, woven into one continuous, harmonious, and simple whole, so plainly depicted, that whosoever witnesses may realize the sacred drama. In the printed volume of the learned theologian we may see written in indelible characters of a living language, and with all the scholarly helps of which the inspired record is patient, the Passion of Christ as depicted, to use a single wide-reaching term, in the tradition of the Church.

To both these aspects of the Passion it is proposed to devote a few pages of comment. In the first place, an effort will be made to show to how large an extent, and in how many ways, the Gospel history is repeated in the latter hours of it, in antitype or reality, by comparison or contrast, as depicted at Ammergau: and how much may be learned by the ordinary spectator, critically following the lead of the

drama, who has either assisted at it directly, as a favoured witness of the enactment, or who has mastered its details through the testimony of others. Next, in a second article, the story of the Passion will be considered from another aspect, which may be best described almost in Abbé Fouard's words. The Passion, as he has treated it, as a portion of the Life of Christ, is an act of faith. Controversy and criticism are equally far banished from his pages. The authenticity, inspiration, and veracity, of the Gospels are simply accepted without proof. A history of the Passion has been written, gathered from the Evangelists, by comparing the four holy witnesses, and showing how their narratives explain and confirm each other—as any other history would be written were the author absolutely and infallibly assured of the truthfulness of his documents. But, more than this has been done in the work in question. Never, says the author, has the East been better known. The Aramaic paraphrases, the Targum, the works of Jewish writers, Talmudic and Rabbinical traditions, Hebrew antiquities, these sources of exegesis have been utilized: and who does not see the advantages offered by such stores of knowledge? But not the least valuable feature in Abbé Fouard's work is the use which he has made of the various readings and glosses of the older codices and versions of Gospels, which modify, expand, limit, change, qualify, or even occasionally alter, the meaning conveyed by the Received Text, or the Authorised Version, whether Catholic or Protestant.

I. Many persons keep the Passion of Christ as a topic for meditation in the forty days of Lent, and contemplate its scenes, sub-divided into the like number of daily portions. Some persons keep the Passion for special consideration during the last fortnight, or the last week of Lent, in Passion-tide or Holy Week. Some concentrate thought upon its awful realities within the limits of a single day in the year—the anniversary of Calvary and its events. Others formally and scientifically meditate on this subject not at all. On the other hand, the Passion of Jesus forms the

life-long contemplation of many—sinners and saints alike. It might be made the life-long meditation of everyone. Perhaps it ought to be so made. For its story, rightly told and devoutly understood, contains all, or nearly all, which men must believe; all, or nearly all, which men may hope for; all, or nearly all, that men do love. And the history of the Passion is set forth at Ammergau, before the eyes of the world—and the uninvited response of the world is a striking testimony in this age to Christianity—in a book which all who run may read. The Passion, in all its manifold details, is here made a spectacle to angels and to men, under conditions which have never been previously fulfilled, and which have hardly been previously possible, in the course of the Passion-Play's chequered career. For, the play is now made accessible to all in civilized Europe—it may be said to all in civilized America and Australasia—who care to witness the sacred drama, and can afford the time and cost of travel—with cheapness, convenience, and comfort. It is performed with outward accessories of scenery, of costume, of appliances, of competent actors, which in their combination are obtainable only in the latter half of the nineteenth century. It is rendered—most ably rendered—with all the traditional knowledge, reiterated experience and persevering training, in word and deed, in delivery, posture, and gesture, of eight or ten generations. It is still rendered with the simplicity, power, and grace, to which all who have written of it in the past bear generous testimony, and on which eye-witnesses in the present day are nearly unanimous. And it is both undertaken and carried out with the piety and devotion of lives dedicated—so far as the conditions of the case admit of such dedication—to the labour and toil, with their attendant rewards, of its not unworthy reproduction.

Hence, a pilgrimage to Ammergau—to one who will undertake the pilgrimage in a temper in harmony with the spirit that inspires the sacred playwrights—is an event in a man's life, be he young or old. It is comparable in religion to two other pilgrimages only. It is comparable to a visit to the Holy Land, and to the actual and traditional sites and scenes consecrated by our Saviour's presence in the

days of His divine manhood—the effect of which, if made in youth, is never effaced. It may be compared also in its results, not in its details, to a sojourning, as an adult, and for a while, in the Eternal City. For, at Rome, the history of the ages—ancient, mediæval, and modern—stamped upon its hills and printed on its stones, only awaits the student's attention to be grasped, in order to record the life of the Church at the central point of its existence. The Passion-Play does as much for the Catholic critic and historian of the New Testament as a pilgrimage to Jerusalem or as a residence in Rome does for the Christian and secular student. It does more for the devotional and affective side of human nature in its more pious moments. A man may have studied the Passion of Jesus—historically, critically, even devotionally—for years. He may have been called in the past to write, speak, or meditate upon it, in public or on his knees. It may have been made by him more or less of a life-study, in this over-exacting and most distracting and dissipating age. Yet, he will not be ashamed to say—nay, he will feel ashamed not to own—that he has learnt much, very much, more than he can at once express, or even at first realize, at Ammergau. He will admit that he has benefitted largely, widely, deeply, both as critic and as Christian, from the simple religious peasantry of the Bavarian highlands, in their religious and almost perfect rendering, ever old but ever new, of the world's great tragedy. Or, rather, and more precisely, if he be a modest man, he will return frank and ungrudging thanks to those hardy villagers. He will thank those aristocrats of nature, those gentlemen and women—for generations refined and cultured by the practice of sacred art—whose histrionic rendering of the Passion has alone been preserved in its integrity from early times, on the principle of the survival of the fittest. He will gladly confess that, for the first time in his life, and apart from the clang of textual criticism and from the discord of biblical harmonists, he has seen with his own eyes, and heard with his own ears, a living, breathing, moving commentary; a consistent, continuous, and complete narrative—in action, in gesture, and in expression—of the Passion of Christ. And, without critically binding himself,

as a humble student of the Bible, to all the innocent, if not, under the circumstances, to all the necessary, liberties taken with the sacred text—whether of addition, omission, or change—he will gratefully admit more. He will admit that much which was formerly obscure in the Gospel narrative has now been made clear; and that much which was always plain has here been made transparent, or has been emphasized and brought into relief. He will allow, perhaps, that some of the types and some of the figures of the New Testament in the Old have had imparted to them, at Ammergau, a new, striking, and unexpected fulfilment. He will allow, certainly, that some facts and words, some events and positions, some references and hints, have appeared altogether in a new light. And he will not deny that many curious points and nice coincidences not previously observed, or only half realized, in the past, have become consciously important, or clearly essential, to the full and right understanding of the sacred text.

These are some of the results, and they are by no means the most important results, which may fairly be expected to ensue to one who, with mind open to impressions, and heart not closed against influences, have made an intelligent and religious pilgrimage to Ammergau.

But more than this may be reasonably looked for from the visit which is here contemplated. Of course, in all such cases the law applies—to him that hath shall be given. The more a visitor takes to the Passion-Play, the more he will carry away with him: the greater the preparation, the greater the gain. And there is one form of preparation that is open to every pilgrim which, perhaps more than any other, will fit him, not only to enjoy the sacred representation as a *spectacle*, but to enter into its spirit with intelligence. The intending visitor, no doubt, will have procured and read much of the ephemeral literature—one work only of which heads the present article—which suddenly sprang into existence in English on the occasion of the last performance of the play. And from some of these booklets or pamphlets he will obtain much information that will prove of value to him—from all he will gain something that will be of use.

The most serviceable handbook, however, to the play, is the New Testament itself; and the most profitable method of studying that handbook is to gain a mastery of the inspired account which it contains before a start is made for Ammergau. And by mastering the threefold or fourfold account of the Passion, is not meant, in this place, pouring over second-hand commentaries—second-rate was the term nearly used. Rather, such mastery may be had by honestly studying the text of the New Testament itself; by making a mental or physical map of its story—far better, with all its mistakes, than one made by another; by creating a rough harmony for oneself; and by noting the repetitions, omissions, and singularities which mark each of the inspired synoptical records, or of the supplementary narrative by the author of the fourth Gospel.

To effect this in an English translation, for the purpose of following with intelligence the acts of the Passion-Play, is by no means a difficult task. It is, indeed, comparatively speaking, easy: for, without altogether ignoring many wide fields of New Testament exegesis, the student may lightly pass over, for the moment, the critical, the dogmatic, the historic, and the typological explanations of the sacred text, and may confine his attention to the very letter of the Gospels as placed in his hands, in the vernacular, by holy Mother Church. No doubt several of the temporarily discarded aspects of the New Testament will be forcibly presented to his mind, again and again, as the play progresses—specially the typological and the historic. He will accept all that he is mentally offered; but, he will not be permanently distracted from his main object. And his main object will be this, namely, to follow literally the lead of the text of the drama; and to observe—what he cannot fail to observe in the course of its development—how large a portion of it is a reproduction, more or less exact, and in some one of many forms, of the Gospel story of the life of Christ. This aspect of the Passion-Play may be explained at greater length somewhat as follows.

II. As the New Testament, rightly understood, may be described as an epitome of our holy religion, in a narrative,

memorial, or epistolary form ; so, the Gospel account of the Passion may be considered, both abstractedly and in the concrete, as an epitome of the New Testament itself. There is, indeed, a very Gospel in the Passion story. Apart from the almost endless questions touching the fourfold interpretation of Scripture, in any given passage, there is scarcely a leading event, or a word of teaching, in the New Testament which does not find an actual or typical counterpart in the records of its concluding pages on the Passion of Christ. The closing scenes of the life of our Lord appear to reproduce, more or less clearly, the story of His sacred infancy, of His childhood, of His three years' ministry. And such reproduction is found in many various shapes, whether in repetition or reflection, by fulfilment, as a parallelism, or by comparison, or by contrast. Some critics of the Ammergau Play have allowed themselves to remark that the types of the Old Testament history which serve as material for the *tableaux* preceding each act of the sacred drama, are novel to them, far-fetched in idea, or intrinsically unreal. Not to enter into the wide topic of typology, it may be observed that such superficial students would, perhaps, be surprised to find how large a portion of the story of the Passion has been anticipated, not indeed in the Old Testament, but in the earlier chapters alone of the Gospel ; and how much of the Passion story is only a completion, in the various senses above indicated, of the Gospel narrative.

It may be pointed out to these and others, in the merest outline, and in but a very few of the cases which crowd the memory as one witnesses the Ammergau representation, that the Gospel of the Passion contains, directly or indirectly, but in miniature, the more part of what we believe, of what we hope for, of what we love. The Passion story holds, as it were, in solution, the elements of Catholic faith, of Catholic aspiration, of Catholic sentiment. Read, for example, those marvellous four chapters of St. John's Gospel—the 14th to the 17th—chapters which contain the last formal dogmatic teaching recorded of Christ to the Apostolic college : and say, if the divine Master's final discourse may not be regarded as an epitome of the New Testament as a religion of faith.

In these chapters, amongst other eternal truths, do we not find the enunciation of these articles of the Christian faith—the Fatherhood of God, the consubstantiality of the Eternal Word, the office and work of the Comforter, who proceedeth from both Divine Persons? Consider the acts and words of the Passion, as detailed by each several Evangelist; and say, whether or not, amidst other good things that we desiderate, now or hereafter, much that we hope for be not either obviously stated, or not obscurely suggested? For instance, these points may be named: God's greater glory; man's eternal good; the love of the Christian brotherhood; the salvation of our own soul; and the final end of man's creation and of man's redemption, his absolute union and oneness with his Creator in the future. Or, take the Gospel story in all its simplicity and in all its fulness, and declare if it does not overflow with record and teaching of all that we ought to, and of all that we do, most deeply reverence and love? For, does it not contain a memorial, in terms true without error or mistake, definite without exaggeration or suppression, exact without essential addition or material omission, in detail as well as in outline, of the Passion of Jesus our Love, as well as of Jesus our Lord, who, under Pontius Pilate the Governor, for us men and for our salvation, was crucified?

III. That the Passion story contains, under the above-named conditions, a compendium of the Gospel, may be illustrated from a rapid consideration of a few amongst many points which are enacted on the broad platform of the theatre at Ammergau. Indeed, if we calculate from the parting at Bethany to the last cry on Calvary, the divine life of three-and-thirty years is almost reproduced in outline in the almost identical number of hours of the Passion. The life shadowed in the sacred infancy, less obscurely indicated in the childhood of Christ, openly evidenced in His missionary career, and made plainer and plainer as the awful end approached, culminates in these concluding hours. Of this certain isolated cases, not always discussed in strict chronological order, in the scanty records of the early years of the Divine Child may be noted, in the first place—

1. The Passion was a time of passive endurance, in which

the very and true God placed Himself at the mercy of His creatures, and patiently awaited His predestinated death. Was it otherwise in the mysterious time at Bethlehem, in the bosom of Mary, when the Eternal Son patiently awaited His pre-ordained birth?

2. Of all the sons of men, our divine Master was pleased more nearly than many others, before and since, to fulfil in His own person the prophetic utterance of His servant Job, touching His entrance into, and departure from, the world. And is it not written of the soldiers beneath the cross, that they parted amongst them the garments of the Virgin-born, and left Him to die in the condition in which He was born?

3. In His dolorous Passion, the Creator of all things is seen bound with cords by the creatures of His almighty hands, and stretched upon the inflexible wood—be it bed, or chair, or saddle, or throne—of the cross. At His birth, do we not read that the fairest work of His creative power wrapped her Creator in swathing bands, and laid Him for shelter from the wintry blast in a cattle manger?

4. In the first hours of His young life, the Child Jesus was surrounded and sheltered by the beasts of the field, faithful in fulfilling the object of their creation; He was carried, by night, without His will being consulted, into Egypt; He was brought again, without concealment, into Judea; and at Nazareth was for years voluntarily subjected to Mary and to Joseph. So, in the awful Passion of the Christ of God—are we not witnesses of His being mobbed by men less faithful than the beasts that perish; of His being captured by night, and led hither and thither by daylight; and if not against His will, yet in His permissive will only, of His being made subject to Annas and Caiphas, and Pilate and Herod?

5. In His early years, the Word of the Father was pleased to be silent amongst men; to be taught to speak by His spotless Mother; to be found, later on, sitting in the Temple of God, in the midst of the Doctors, humbly hearing them, and meekly asking them questions. During His Passion-woes He is again in their midst, no longer a child: He is standing before the Governor; He is under examina-

tion by the Jewish Sanhedrim. Did not Jesus then hold His peace, insomuch that Pilate marvelled and the High Priest adjured? and did not the Word and Wisdom of God, hearing the taunts of His enemies, accept their accusation, and openly make answer, "Thou hast said: I am"?

Now, all these and many more fulfilments, parallelisms, and contrasts in the Gospel of the Childhood and the Gospel of the Passion, are visibly, aurally, circumstantially exhibited, in minutest detail, in the sacred drama at Ammergau. The silence and the speech of Christ; His capture in the Garden, and enforced subjection to Jew and Gentile, conqueror and conquered; His being bound with cords, and placed upon the rigid wood of the cross; His utter dereliction, and the division of His garments, and the gambling for His seamless vesture on Golgotha; and the infinitely patient endurance of His sufferings, during His Passion—all these anti-types of His early childhood, are they not exhibited afresh in presence of the representatives of the Christian world in the words and actions and gestures of the Play at Ammergau? They are. They are enacted anew, week after week, before the eyes of that vast, reverent and spell-bound audience, cosmopolitan and Catholic, which witness them: and he is wanting either in the elements of his New Testament knowledge, or in the power to apply and utilize such knowledge, who fails mentally to supply the type as the sacred anti-type is presented to his understanding verbally, or actively in dramatic reality.

The like evidence that the Gospel of the Passion is an epitome of the Gospel of the three years' Ministry, is equally obvious at Ammergau. Naturally, from the conditions of the case, the evidence is even more particular, exact, and detailed than the instances already reproduced. Of course, in this place, only the merest fragment of such evidence can be offered for criticism; and that only in brief.

Consider, however:—

1. The introduction, as it were, to the mission-life of Christ—His fasting in the wilderness for forty days; who, when it was ended, was permitted to tempt him? how and in what manner, during His trial, He was tempted, namely, to assert

His divinity? At three o'clock on Good Friday, the Master had probably been fasting for forty hours, if we include in this estimate the religious fast preceding the Paschal Feast; He was tempted by the Tempter in the person of man, under many forms—Jew, Galilean, and Roman; He was tempted to deny His divinity, as previously He had been tempted to avow it.

2. Christ, in preparation for His earthly ministry, sent forth His disciples, by two and two, in order to prepare a way before Him; He gathered around Him apostles on the Mount; He taught them the elements of His religion, and pronounced an abstract of its practice in the Ten Beatitudes. Previously to His Passion, He again sent two of His most trusted friends and followers to prepare a place in which to celebrate the last Passover and to institute the first Eucharist; He gathered together the apostolic college in the Upper Chamber, and taught them the higher mysteries of the faith; He finally uttered His last Seven Words from the Cross, which at least share with the Beatitudes the attention of the world—words of pardon, of promise, of sympathy, of complaint, of desire, of fulfilment, of commendation.

3. Our Saviour's first manifestation of His power before His mission, was done at the instance of His Blessed Mother, at a marriage feast, and water was turned into wine; and twice afterwards did He multiply a few loaves to feed the bodies of a few thousand of famishing men. His last private manifestation of divine power, before the crucifixion, Mary being present in spirit, if not in person, took place after the Paschal Feast, when bread became the super-substantial Food of Angels, powerful to suffice the famishing souls of an universe, and the Cenacolo became the anti-type of Cana in Galilee.

4. Three favoured apostles were chosen to witness their Master's glory on Thabor, when Moses and Elias assisted at the revelation, and a bright cloud overshadowed them all. The same favoured three were deemed worthy to watch with their Lord in the Garden, when the dark pall of night overhung them, under the olive-trees, and a created angel was sent to strengthen in His agony the Uncreated.

5. Again, in former days, and amongst His own people, Christ could do no mighty work because of the unbelief of His fellow-countrymen; His words were misapprehended; His deeper teaching was denied by friend and foe alike. It was not otherwise in the hours of His Passion. Our Blessed Lord, for the like cause, was powerless in Jerusalem even to speak the truth, because He would not be believed by the Jews; and the words of His friends on the sacraments of the Eucharist, Baptism, or Confession are fairly comparable with those of the false witnesses, "Destroy this temple;" or to those of the chief priests, "I am the King of the Jews."

6. Even that singular episode, of which no sufficient explanation (it is believed) has yet been given—the expressed wish of certain Greeks to see Jesus, is paralleled in the last hours of Christ by other not less singular episodes which, speaking humanly, come from nothing and lead to nothing in the history of the Passion; and which, having been placed on record in the inspired narrative, are then dismissed. Of these there are not less than four in the Gospel of the Passion, one being handed down by each of the Evangelists—the dream of Pilate's wife; the delivery of our Lord, in the first place, to Annas; the friendship of Pilate and Herod renewed over the captive person of our Lord God; and the young man's action who followed the procession to Golgotha, having a linen cloth cast about his body.

All these points, again, except the last one, are illustrated in the Passion Play at Ammergau, in the sight of all who will be at the pains to look below the surface and decipher them—the arbitrary, unaccountable episodes which stand out solitarily in the evangelistic story: the deliberate and intentional perjury of the false witnesses; our Master's almighty powerlessness against wilful unbelief; the election of the highly favoured three to witness His glory and His agony alike; the scenes in the Cenacolo; the mission of faith and love, Peter and John, in preparation for Christian mysteries; His supernatural fast, and the temptation of Christ by the high priest, the chief priests, the Jewish people, and the Roman soldiery.

Neither is the element of the miraculous, as it is termed, absent from the Gospel of the Passion, in ways paralleled by, or antithetical to, those with which we are familiar in the Gospel of the Ministry; and this, whether in act or in word.

Take but a few obvious instances in support of this position:—

1. More than once did our Blessed Lord Himself escape by supernatural agency from the malice of His enemies, or from the indiscretion of His friends, during His three years of mission. Now, in the midst of His Passion-woes, and with one almighty word, “Let these go their way,” He ensures the escape of His apostles from the garden on the night of His apprehension.

2. Shortly after His transfiguration, when He descended from the mount, our Saviour healed the faithful servant of the centurion, who earnestly besought the cure. Directly after His agony, before He was led away by the temple guard, Christ healed the servant of the faithless high priest, who asked it not.

3. The unwilling testimony of the unclean or possessing spirits to the Godhead of Christ is noteworthy during the years of the ministry. In the hours of the Passion, the unconscious witness of the multitude, with a band of soldiers and officers, to our Saviour’s Deity is even more remarkable. For, we read that at the incommunicable Name, I Am, they went backward and fell to the ground. And, if we turn from act to word, it will not fail to strike the student of Scripture that the absolute foreknowledge of our divine Lord, which was exhibited in many ways in the period of His ministry, is not without a counterpart in the time of His Passion. For instance: did He not foretell to Peter and John what would befall them on entering the Holy City, in order to prepare for their Master the Passover? Did He not warn the traitor of his treachery; and indicate, by sign and deed, afterwards understood by the apostles, the person of the traitor; and intimate to the eleven the near approach of Judas in Gethsemani? Did He not also warn His chiefest apostle, the great saint of the future, the not yet saint of to-day, of his threefold sad denial of his Master, and warn the

apostles in a body against seeking the first place? and did He not foretell that all should be offended because of Him, and that the flock should be scattered? And in the very same night did not Peter deny? was there not a strife amongst the apostolic college who should be the greatest? and before the day dawned had not all the trusted eleven forsaken Him and fled? And, not to go more deeply into this matter, did not our Saviour allude beforehand to His sufferings and death, both in general terms and in specific detail, to His rising again, to his apparition in Galilee, and to His ascension, where He was before? And were not all these pre-announcements duly and literally fulfilled?

Every one of these coincidences here mentioned, and many more that have been left unnamed, are enacted before the eyes of the spectator in the Passion Play at Ammergau. It is probable that the careful and exact attention which has been bestowed upon these and other incidents, apparently of secondary moment in the course of the drama, but really of main importance to a faithful reproduction of the sacred story, has done much to give to the Play, however inconsequentially, the title, in public estimation, which is fully deserved on other grounds, of "scriptural." In any case, it will be allowed that he only will have failed to read the Gospel in the Passion, repeated in the histrionic features of the Ammergau drama, who has failed to master the Gospel of the Ministry described in the pages of the New Testament.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

THE "LEAKAGE" FROM THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN.

MANY able and interesting articles on this subject, under different headings, have appeared from time to time in the I. E. RECORD. "Missionary Rector" and "Missionary Coadjutor" (1890) have crossed swords over it; while Father Vaughan (vol. viii., 343), with saintly humility, has asked us to deplore and stem the vast "leakage" that admittedly exists from the Catholic Church in Britain, at the foot of the tabernacle. The pages of *The Month*, *The Dublin Review*, *The Tablet*, &c., have also been devoted to discussing the subject. Dr. Tynan's interesting paper in the July number of the I. E. RECORD brings the matter fairly well down to date.

To those accustomed to read narratives of conversions to Catholicity in England and Scotland, accounts of Catholic missions being multiplied, and of churches, convents, and schools being erected and adorned in these countries, the news that, instead of advancing, the Church is, in fact, losing ground, will come with much surprise. Many will be startled at reading that the "*vital*" question for the Church in England to-day "is not the conversion of Protestants," but "the conversion of Catholics themselves;" or rather the retention of its own children in the faith of their fathers. And yet, such is the statement made by Dr. Tynan, and equivalently made by many others, from sources and opportunities of information that entitle them to be outspoken on the matter.

We would all wish that things were not so, and that the experiences the learned doctor gives in sustainment of his views, are exceptional and his statistics inconclusive. We would fain see more brilliant prospects for the return of England to the true fold than he holds out to us. However, an abundance of proof exists to convince us that vast numbers (Dr. Tynan computes those who have fallen away in England alone at well-nigh a million of souls) who were baptized

Catholics, fall away from the faith and become practically apostates. This, surely, is a gloomy prospect for the return of Britain to the faith, and one that calls for the most anxious exertions of all concerned. To none should it bring greater grief than to the Irish bishops, priests, and people: for, do not our "kith and kin" make up the vast numbers of those so falling away? By none should it be more seriously taken into consideration than by the Catholics of Great Britain, both lay and clerical; and even Rome itself must regard it with very grave anxiety. I offer no apology, therefore, save my inability to treat of it properly, for asking space for my views on this question in any Catholic publication. To anyone who may think me a "fool" for rushing in "where angels fear to tread," I would respectfully say,

"Si quid novisti rectius istis"
"Candidus imperti: si non, his utere mecum."

To catholicise Great Britain, I agree with Dr. Tynan, that the first and chief thing to do, even if there were no other motive, is to retain in the Church all those born of Catholic parents, and to pass them out of this world in the faith of their fathers, transmitting to their offspring, unsullied, the priceless inheritance of the true faith. It is easier to retain than to convert; and, were all, or nearly all, born of Catholic parents, professing Catholics in Great Britain to-day, the Church would be far more stalwart in itself and far more powerful in upsetting heresy and in resisting infidelity. To stop the disastrous "leakage" that undoubtedly exists, its location in the Catholic body should be determined and its causes examined, so that, if possible, effective remedies may be applied.

Some persons treat of it only as if it refers to the children of the Green Isle. Such is by no means the case. There are numbers of French, German, and Italian-speaking people in England and Scotland, Catholics by birth and early education: not merely do they not go to mass, but they don't rank themselves as Catholics at all. They don't contribute to the support of priests, or to the erection of

churches, convents, or schools, as many of the indifferent Irish do. They have become ashamed of their faith, or they act as if they can get on better by not professing it. They marry in heretical places of worship, or in registry offices; and rarely, indeed, are the children of such people baptized. Hardly ever are they sent to Catholic schools. Catholicity in Great Britain is unquestionably suffering great loss by such apostasy. Those who have experience of missionary work in the great English and Scotch centres will, I believe, agree with me that the practice, and even the profession, of the Catholic faith amongst other nationalities than the Irish, are things that are not much known (although vast numbers of such persons, many of whom must have been Catholics, have migrated into Britain and remain there), and that those who retain the profession of their faith the best, and who transmit it with the fewest losses by wilful apostasy, proportionally, are the children of St. Patrick. Catholic writers on the subject will all, I am sure, agree with me in this; and they will not deny the Irish all the credit that is their due for the catholicization of Britain. This, I venture to say, is nearly all that has been done for the Church in that country for the last forty years.

It is extremely difficult to counteract the "leakage" that exists amongst Germans, French, Italians, and other foreigners in England and Scotland. Faith, in such cases, is very often dead. The practice of attending mass and the sacraments may have been given up before such people left their homes. Their new associations are almost wholly non-Catholic, if not actually heretical or infidel; and the want of better class schools to compete with the grammar schools of the towns in which they settle down, completes in the second and for subsequent generations, the apostasy commenced in the first. To stem this "leakage" seems very hopeless as long as the Catholics in Great Britain belong almost entirely to the sons and daughters of manual toil; but, nevertheless, Catholic unions and Catholic clubs, acting in unison with the great Catholic organizations of the Continent, might do much in the desired direction. If the clergy in their various districts became aware of the abode

of such persons (as they could do, if Catholic unions were really effective), something might be done by timely and friendly visits to them. Where their numbers and goodness permit, Italian, German, and French churches are, I suppose, in existence for them. Such churches, however, cannot be sufficiently numerous; and, perhaps, the formation of Catholic guilds, consisting of such foreigners and presided over by priests who thoroughly understand their language, would do something to retain them in the Catholic faith. A combination of even a few in one centre, and a connection and sympathy with a similar few in adjoining centres, might foster a good Catholic tone amongst them, rouse them to religious fervour, and stimulate them into zealous action for the salvation of their compatriots.

I can speak with greater confidence, because I have greater knowledge, of the "leakage" amongst the Irish.

That "leakage" is truly deplorable, and if much more be not done to stop it, it is likely to increase in tenfold magnitude amongst the descendants of those who left Ireland for England and Scotland in the present half century. Those English-born Irish, though very frequently more Irish than the Irish themselves, don't drink in their faith from their mothers' breasts. They don't grow up in it, regarding it as more valuable than life itself. They are nurtured by parents who have been affected by the religious indifference in the midst of which their lot is cast; and they come in contact, in mills, mines, and market-places, with alluring vices that kill religious instincts, and with associations that inevitably contaminate pure faith. All the greater care and zeal, therefore, are required for them; and hopeless as the task would seem, discouraging as the efforts of truly missionary priests may appear, the Catholic Church and the grace of God are powerful enough to succeed.

Of the "leakage" amongst the Irish the causes are of various kinds. Some are on the part of the people themselves; others are traceable to the foes of our faith; and some others, perhaps, may be found in the deficiency of Catholic organization and in the working of the Church itself.

The causes that may be said to be the fault of the people themselves are chiefly—(a) intemperance ; (b) mixed marriages ; and (c) carelessness of religious duties.

These causes must be met by the usual weapons of the Catholic Church, assisted by such aids, not purely religious, as the circumstances of time and locality will provide.

It is undoubtedly true that great zeal is manifested in the use of these weapons by bishops, priests, and many Catholic laymen. Young men's societies, clubs, confraternities, leagues, libraries, &c., are worked in many places to stem the evils in question ; and frequently the smallness of the success apparent is most discouraging. The success, however, gained is greater than that apparent ; for, when zeal is of a preventive kind, its achievements are hidden and known only to God Himself. Greater things, however, must be done, and done in a greater number of places, if intemperance and its crowd of evils are to be stayed, and a stop put to its fecund generation of apostates. It destroys most of the Irish in Britain who fall away from the faith, body and soul ; it paralyzes their success in life, robs them of all happiness and social influence, makes them a disgrace to their country and to their creed : and they become by it a stumbling-block in the onward march of the Church of God. All the religious strength, as well as all the political power and social influence of the Irish people, at home and abroad, should be employed against it. Individual zeal will produce only a transitory effect if the laws do not assist in removing the temptations and encouragements to intemperance. Purely political considerations should not divide the Irish people on this great religious question ; nor would their power in England be one whit the less, but much the greater, if they were united upon it.

But what is to be done with mixed marriages ? A priest on an English mission told me, some time ago, that on one "road" in his district, and in the streets emptying into it, he counted over one hundred mixed marriages. In almost all these cases the Catholic party had practically given up the faith ! Similar stories are very numerous, and it seems to be agreed that mixed marriages are causing a vast amount

of the "leakage." No wonder the Church with its unerring wisdom and foresight has most emphatically condemned such nuptials, and warned long ago and repeatedly the Catholics of Britain against them. "*Tanquam illicitas ac perniciosas tum ob flagitiosam in Divinis communionem, tum ob impendens Catholico conjugii perversionis periculum, tum ob pravam sobolis institutionem.*" It seems the Church merely tolerates them, and it orders that they are never to be permitted unless "*gravibus dumtaxat de causis atque aegre admodum fit,*" and on certain well-known conditions. The seasonable publication of the laws of the Church, and well-reasoned explanations of them from the pulpit and the Catholic press, will do much to prevent mixed marriages; but they will continue, and they must be looked upon as a necessary evil, in a country where Catholics count as only one to ten of the population. To have as few of them as may be, is ardently to be desired and laboured for; but to have those that are entered into, celebrated in the Catholic church, those in charge of souls should zealously endeavour. Vehement denunciations of their sinfulness elsewhere than in the Catholic church, and a salutary infusion of a holy dread of divine vengeance if celebrated elsewhere, will do much with those persons who have not yet lost the Catholic faith and spirit, to prevent, at all events, the sacrilegious reception of the seventh sacrament.* That sacrament being religiously received, and an acquaintanceship formed between the priest and the non-Catholic party, the removal of prejudice from the latter will primarily result. A friendly visitation, directed by a well-kept *status animarum*, will then very often bring about an exact compliance with the conditions on which the dispensation was granted. Should that be so, the outcome very probably will be that, not merely will the Catholic party continue in the practice of the Catholic religion, and all the children of the marriage be brought up Catholics, but the non-Catholic party will sometimes be converted. Migration from district to district, and from town to town, militates against this system of visitation. In most cases, however, the parties migrating can be brought under the cognizance of the priest in the new district; and,

if he in his zeal "take up the running" where it was left off in the former parish, the same desirable results may be realized.

As to negligence of mass and the sacraments being a cause of eventual, virtual apostasy, and thereby of a great "leakage" from the Church—it would, indeed, seem that such negligence can hardly be distinguished from the "leakage" itself. Nevertheless I am far from admitting that the vast number of those Irish Catholics who, in England and Scotland, miss mass, and absent themselves from the sacraments even for years, have given up the faith. No. I have met thousands of such persons in an experience of several years, and hardly ever did I meet one that wished to do so.

Even the most careless Irish, as a class, are easily influenced by a sympathetic priest. On them should prudent, timely, friendly zeal be exercised; and, unquestionably, it will be largely profitable. Much tact, however, is required in the exercise of it; for the best meant exertions frequently come to nought, even after great labour and prayer, because of the manner in which the Irish people are spoken to and spoken of, and sometimes because of pushing theological views, inimical to an Irishman's sense of patriotism, needlessly and defencelessly too far. The peculiarities of this people must be allowed for. They should themselves be treated with respect and friendship, as well as with urbanity and charity. They should be exhorted and admonished, and not upbraided and threatened; and when brought to the church, whether to an early mass at which bad clothes would induce them to prefer to attend, or to a week-evening service, to which, for the same reason, they often prefer to go rather than to the Sunday evening service, they should be instructed in plain and forcible language on religious truths and obligations, and they should be exhorted *with unction* to persevere in the profession of the former and the fulfilment of the latter.

In reference to the "leakage" that occurs amongst Irish people arising from the avowed opponents of their creed, I would consider that most of it concerns the children of the very poor and the very careless. Associating with infidels in clubs and lecture-halls does something to shake and

destroy the faith of some of our people. Reading misrepresentations of Catholic practices, and hearing attacks on Catholic truths, veiled in sophistry, do also something to undermine the faith of the Irish in Great Britain; but those of them brought up Catholics, are proof enough, so far, against such temptations, save in rare instances. The deserted children, the orphans, the juvenile Catholic inmates of English and Scotch workhouses, by being hired out to non-Catholics at an early age, almost always lose their faith, and there seems at present no adequate way of saving them from this heartrending fate. Priests may do a deal for their spiritual welfare while such members of their flocks remain in workhouses—where, indeed, it is very hard for them to practise Christian virtues. But boards of guardians will get rid of them on principles of economy at as early an age as they can. If they have any concern for their religion when parting with them it will be to have it destroyed, and if they are compelled to take some steps for its preservation they will content themselves with being promised that the children's religion will not be interfered with. Rarely is such a promise kept. I have known instances where poor law boards were told of an expressed intention on the part of applicants for children as servants to proselytize them. The board was besought not to entrust the children to such masters, in these circumstances, no matter what promises were made. It acted, however, on the promise principle, and gave a month's trial. The proselytism was accomplished within that period, and on a child stating she did not wish to go to mass, or to be a Catholic any longer, the guardians were too liberal-minded to interfere with her "free choice!" What is to be done to stop this "leakage"? May I commend the matter to the earnest consideration of the Catholic association that, I understand, has been recently formed in England for protecting Catholic interests?

Is any portion of the "leakage" amongst the Irish people traceable to the working of the Catholic Church itself in England and Scotland?

This may seem a very disrespectful—nay, even an impertinent—question, if it is to be answered in the affirmative.

However, I think it would be deplorable to be fastidious where I mean no disrespect, and when the most important of all issues is involved.

"S. V." wrote in the May number of last year's I. E. RECORD, assigning to "dearth of love and patience" on the part of some clerics a considerable portion of the "leakage." A "Missionary Coadjutor," in the June number, would seem to point to an unequal distribution of work, and an excessive amount of duty for some priests, as a cause of it. Dr. Tynan in his able "Plea for Discipline" (September, 1890), and Fr. Vaughan on the "Leakage" (vol. viii., 343), would indicate other sources of the loss of faith in the working of the Church itself. Be these true causes or not, I think there is one cause that has not been touched upon up to the present. It is a supposed necessity of "chapel brass," as it is sometimes called, for admission to mass on Sundays.

Rightly or wrongly the Irish in many places in England and Scotland consider that they are required to pay for admission to mass on Sundays; and what they consider is required of them, amounts to a considerable sum each Sunday where a whole household is taken into consideration.

This requirement, whether it be real or imaginary, is the cause of much of the negligence of mass of which the Irish people are guilty, and which so often results in practical apostasy. How often is not the want of "chapel brass" alleged as the reason for missing mass? How often is not such omission the beginning of a "break down" in the best resolutions? How often is it not the commencement of the relapse of a poor penitent?

The Irish poor are proud. They find it hard, even when their inability to pay entrance money arises from their own fault, to meet with obstruction from a door collector; to be humiliated by him; and to be relegated, if admitted, to places set apart for those unable to pay. Frequently, inexcusable and highly culpable though they know their conduct to be, they absent themselves entirely, rather than be thus humiliated; and thus is lost the great chance of their reformation, and commences a sinful habit which ends in their being lost to the Church,

It is not merely the poor that keep away owing to chapel money having come to be regarded as required: many "fairly well off," where a number out of a family ought to attend mass every Sunday, find "chapel-going" expensive. The Irish-reared portion of this class rarely grumble on this head. They would give their last sixpence to their religion. But their children, grown up in England and Scotland, earning wages and retaining control over it from an early age, think more of money and less of mass; and having to pay for their music halls, benefit societies, clubs, &c., they easily avail themselves of the bad example of religious negligence they see around them, to save the Church entrance money.

I know the answer that can be given to these views:—priests must be supported; schools must be maintained; churches must be supplied with their requirements; heavy interest must be paid; large debts must be wiped out; and new churches, schools and missions must be started.

I grant all this, and I avow that too much credit cannot be given to those who have supplied Great Britain, in most difficult circumstances, with so many beautiful churches, convents, schools, and other Catholic institutions. By having done so, they did what mortals could to save the poor Irish that were driven from their own country, and their children, in the faith of their fathers, so far. Too much gratitude cannot be paid to those who laboured so hard, begging, in the past, for the erection of these religious buildings. The debt system, however, was necessary to supplement their praiseworthy exertions, and, like mixed marriages, it has been a necessary evil. Everything provided by borrowing costs at least double its value, and if things that are not absolutely necessary are waited for, till their cost is presented or collected, they would then be had at their value and in good time enough. There would not then be the same necessity for big church door collections. Expensive outlays have not attracted many converts; but have they not kept away many Catholics? If I might express an opinion, therefore, without giving offence, I would respectfully submit that, if the "leakage" is to be stopped, the debt system in England and Scotland should be got rid of as soon as possible,

and, for that purpose, that things that are not urgently needed be done without for the present. I would wish the day had come when all Catholics could enter their churches without their fearing to be repelled for want of money, or to be hurt in their feelings by being relegated to humiliating places in the house of God. As in the postal and railway systems, income has vastly increased by a decrease of charges; so, I think, church income would likewise increase, if charges for admission were diminished; greater numbers would attend, the offertory plate would be better supported, and much of the "leakage" would be stopped.

Another cause that may render partially ineffective the efforts of priests in England and Scotland in retaining so many of the Irish and their descendants in the practice of their faith, is, I think, clerical inaction, outside religion, for their welfare.

In no country in the world have priests so much influence for good as in Ireland. No people on God's earth are more amenable to the ministers of our holy faith than the Irish. Why is it that so much can be made of them at home; that, at the words of their pastors, they will do anything and dare everything? Because they find the priest in Ireland in "touch" with them in all their legitimate aspirations; and because they know he is their friend, ready to use his talents, influence, and position, for their welfare. Why is it that these same people (the most faithful to God's Church all the world over, and the most exemplary at home in the practice of Christian virtue), are abandoning it in such numbers, and becoming a disgrace to it in Great Britain? I fear one reason is, that there is not enough of priests in that country who understand them, who are "in touch" with them, and who prove to them that they sympathize with them in their legitimate aspirations. Unless a priest is "in touch" with his people, and sympathizes with their legitimate aspirations as far as the laws of his Church permit, he is in danger of being regarded as a mere mechanical apparatus for the application of God's graces; and such priests, be they Irish, English, French, or Dutch, in Ireland, England, or Scotland, would soon reduce the Church in these countries

to the humiliating position it occupies on the continent. I believe in priests taking active part (*exceptis excipiendis*) in the legitimate efforts of the vast bulk of their people, who, in Great Britain, are almost all Irish, for a satisfactory redress of the wrongs of their country, for the amelioration of the condition of the working classes that constitute the vast portion of their flock, and for the general welfare of the public at large; and I submit that their abstention deprives them of influence for religious good in the present, and is calculated to relegate them, even amongst their own people, to positions of trifling influence in the settlement of social questions affecting religion, in the not distant future. I also think that judicious and manly action in these matters, on the part of priests, will save their people from irreligious control, and give the Church an influence over them that will enable it to mould them as it wishes for religious purposes. Cardinal Manning has made himself a power amongst the English masses, in spite of their diabolical hatred of his sacred character, by his invariably showing himself their friend. He has been none the less the friend of truth, justice, and religion, in so doing; and if the Irish people are to be retained in their faith in England and Scotland, they must be able to recognise as their friends, the priests of their Church, and not the Bradlaughs and Besants of the infidel schools. That the clergy of Britain may prove themselves entitled to such recognition, they have only to imitate the exalted lead given to all ecclesiastics by Leo XIII. and Cardinal Manning. To do so, and thus to save their Irish flocks from socialistic and infidel inroads, next to their sanctity, everything depends on their education and sympathetic zeal.

The years we are passing through should be of deep interest to Irish Catholics, and they are most momentous ones for the Church in England and Scotland. The descriptions of the "leakage" (almost all of which refer to the Irish) we meet with in Catholic publications make me ask, Can Ireland do anything to help in stopping it? A million of souls fallen away from the Church! writes Dr. Tynan.¹ A

¹ I. E. RECORD, July, 1891.

well-known London priest said some time ago, that almost nine out of every ten boys were lost sight of after leaving school !¹ "If we look around in our churches, where," asks Fr. Richardson² "are the vast numbers of youths that have passed through our schools during the past five years?" What's the good of trying to get them to Catholic schools, he despondingly seems to say, when they drift away from the faith in such numbers? In a district in Scotland (an esteemed correspondent informs me) in which Catholics had been fairly numerous, there are many villages where the faith is gradually dying out. I gather from the recent census that, although in one large town (which may be taken as a sample of many great centres of labour where Irish usually congregate) the whole population has largely increased within ten years, the Catholics have decreased, though the Irish are known to be a prolific race ! Is not this alarming? And such the state of things amongst a people of whom Cardinal Manning³ wrote some years ago:—"I know no country in the world more truly Christian, nor any Catholic people that has retained its faith and traditions more inviolate !" And these are the people that are giving up their faith and propagating indifferentism in such numbers within a few hours' journey of the land of their birth !

Can anything more be done than is being done to stop this state of things ? Are there enough priests in Britain to effectively minister to their Irish people ? It may be said there are as many as can be decently supported amongst the church-going people : and these priests, in most cases, are overworked. But there is manifestly work for more priests ; and, if these would speak effectively and work with sympathetic zeal, a superabundance of support would arise for them, even from these now "leaking" away.

But can such priests be got ? Can even enough of reliable vocations be had for the Catholic colleges of Britain ? If there be any of these wants, Ireland, that should be so eager

¹ I. E. RECORD, vol. xi., 661.

² I. E. RECORD, vol. vii., 155.

³ Letter to the late Primate of All Ireland. His Eminence excludes Rome as outside comparison.

for the preservation of the faith amongst its own people, and that always has done so much for the propagation of the faith all the world over, would not be appealed to in vain.

These fleeting years are most momentous ones for the Church in England and Scotland. Both these countries are now getting a chance such as they did not get since the Reformation, and such as they are not likely to get again. The Irish people have been mercilessly driven from their own country, and God who takes good out of evil, uses their very oppression to rekindle the light of faith amongst their oppressors. As by the prayer of St. Stephen, St. Paul was converted, so, it would seem, from the sufferings of the Irish, God wishes to bring back the British people to the faith of Becket and Augustine. This is England's chance, therefore ; and, should it glide, in vain may another be expected.

I do not despair of a happy outcome. The conversion of a nation is pre-eminently a work of divine grace, and God, who out of the stones of Jerusalem can raise up children to Abraham, will, ere long, let us hope and pray, stud the once grand old Catholic plains of Britain with a population intensely Catholic and religious. Though vast masses of English people are not coming over to the Church, the tremendous prejudice that existed some years ago is fast dying out. Who would have thought that so great a change could come over the minds of the people of Great Britain on the political question, as has taken place in the last decade of years ? May not a similar change take place on the religious question, even in the next decade ? The English people are, at bottom, a religiously inclined, if a worldly people. Let us only convince them, charitably, that they are in error on a question of transcendent importance, and, with the grace of God, their conversion will be soon accomplished.

JOHN CURRY, P.P.

THE APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER: ITS ORIGIN, PROGRESS, AND ORGANIZATION.¹

THE organized devotion to the Sacred Heart, known as the *Apostleship of Prayer*, or *League of the Sacred Heart*, is now so widely established throughout the Catholic world, and producing such marvellous results, that we think it advisable to furnish in the I. E. RECORD a brief account of its nature and advantages.

ITS MEANING.

The word *Apostleship* brings with it the idea of doing something like an apostle. Now, one of the first and primary advantages of this association is, that it makes each member virtually an apostle; that, whilst each member cannot leave home, and go into distant or infidel countries, yet, by joining this association and keeping to its rules, each member can gain the merit of an apostle, and can really do an apostle's work. This fact alone is sufficient to render this holy devotion worthy of being examined and fully known.

ITS ORIGIN

And this idea of apostleship originated in a foreign missionary college. Young men were being prepared for the foreign missions, in the Jesuit College of Puy, a town about seventy miles distant from Lyons, in the south of France. It is needless to say that the young men's minds were entirely bent on their future avocations; and it is needless, too, to say that the fathers appointed to direct the studies and spiritual exercises of these levites were men who were themselves full of missionary zéol. To the eyes of scholars and masters, the harvest indeed stood ripe, and the labourers were few; and the question most at their heart was, How could they render present and immediate assistance in that harvest field?

¹ We have much pleasure in publishing this paper, which is intended as a reply to several inquiries regarding the organization of "The Apostleship of Prayer."—Ed. I. E. R.

On the feast of St. Francis Xavier, the great missionary apostle, in the year 1844, the problem was thus solved by Father Gautrelet, S.J., Spiritual Director of the College. He pointed out that by consecrating all their thoughts, words, actions, and sufferings to the Sacred Heart, and offering them to the Eternal Father for the interests of Jesus Christ, they could find, even during their college course, ample opportunity for satisfying their missionary zeal. "The proposal," we read, "was received with enthusiasm by the young religious, and thus were laid the first foundations of *The Apostleship of Prayer*, which was destined to spread with wondrous rapidity throughout the world, and to inscribe on its registers many millions of associates." At present the number is supposed to be coming towards thirty million souls, and by the time the little mustard-seed reaches its golden jubilee, in 1894, it will in all likelihood be far beyond it.

All these twenty or thirty millions, every morning, unite in offering up all their thoughts, words, acts, and sufferings during the day for the one same thing. That one thing to be prayed for is appointed month by month; and the subject of prayer for the month is approved, if not directly chosen, by the Supreme Pontiff himself. It is not alone that they pray—and it is written that if two or three ask anything of the Father in Christ's name it will be given to them—they do more; they offer acts, words, and sufferings; and that *morning act or offering* is made by over twenty million of people. If it may be permitted to take a simile from the old Grecian warfare, they thus form a Grecian phalanx, irresistible in their onset at whatever point they attack.

LEAGUE OF THE SACRED HEART.

But there is something still better. The Sacred Heart of our Lord is not dead, but living. It is living in heaven; and in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. It is living, "always living to make intercession for us." That is its continual and ever-blessed work—"always living to make intercession for us." With that cry of the Sacred Heart going up from the multitudes of altars on earth, and which

is "heard for its reverence," the cry of twenty millions joins, and the phials of the angels bear this glorious incense before God. The prayers, works, and sufferings of the twenty millions of people become transformed and glorified, because of their connection with the Sacred Heart, and are thus rendered immeasurably more pleasing before God. This, then, is the League of the Sacred Heart; innumerable souls joining their piteous cry with the "strong cry" of the Sacred Heart of Jesus for the salvation of souls and the triumph of the Church.

Our Blessed Lady, too, is joined with this praying multitude; for what interest of the Sacred Heart can be indifferent to the Heart of Mary? This, then, is the reason why in the morning offering the associates say: "Oh, Jesus! *through the most pure Heart of Mary*, I offer the prayers, works, and sufferings of this day, for the intentions of Thy divine Heart, and I offer them especially for the intention assigned to this month and to this day." An associate may not always know the *general intention* for the month; but, evidently it is better that he should, as in that case his prayer, in all likelihood, will be more earnest and more fully from the heart.

It has for its motto or legend the words taken from our Blessed Lord's prayer—"Thy kingdom come." "By this we beg," says the little catechism, "that God may reign in our hearts by His grace in this life, and that we may reign with Him for ever in the next." That is what the associates ask and pray for—that God may reign in the hearts of all, but most especially in their own. That is their one wish and aim—that the kingdom of God may come. If that were accomplished, earth indeed would need no more.

A TEMPORAL ADVANTAGE.

Before passing from this view of the subject, there is one aspect more under which this devotion is beautifully attractive and consoling. When the divine Saviour was on earth He graciously condescended to do many temporal favours for those in sorrow and distress, as well as to cure their souls. The poor woman from the Philistine borders brought

her little girl; the Israelitish father brought his son; the ruler asked Him for his boy—in fact, as soon as they knew Him to be in a town, they brought their sick from the whole country round, and “virtue went out from Him,” “He cured all.” Poor human kind is stricken to-day as then. The wail of the sorrowing heart is heard in our time as it was nineteen centuries ago. The appeal is sent to the Central Director. At the beginning of the month he asks, through *The Messenger*, the prayers of the associates for those whom God has laid a heavy hand on; sometimes it is sickness, sometimes want of employment, sometimes an erring or a lost friend; and the associates put themselves in the place of the wounded one, and in their morning offering they “bear the infirmities” of their sorrowing brother or sister before the Heart of Him who hath known how to have compassion on all.

PROGRESS AND APPROVAL.

The first thing that an ecclesiastic will, as a rule, ask, is—Is this devotion known to the Church, and has it its sanction? It is almost unnecessary to answer the question; for, in the Church of God nothing will increase and multiply that has not the approval of the Holy See; and this has increased and multiplied, it might fairly be said, beyond precedent. It is in every country in the world, and it has no less than thirty authorized organs, preaching to nearly as many races and peoples.

In its lifetime it has seen but two Popes almost; for it might scarcely be said to be known at all when the late Pope Pius of venerable memory ascended the throne in 1846. But he was only three years Pope when it became known to him; and it was while he was an exile at Gaeta, in 1849, that, pondering over it, reviewing in his own mind its nature and its evident usefulness in the Catholic world, that he approved of it, and enriched it with many indulgences. This gave it a publicity and a standing that hitherto it had not. Religious communities began to fraternize with it; holy bishops gave it welcome to their dioceses; and zealous

priests and pious lay people endeavoured with eagerness and success to propagate it.

In the year 1861 appeared the first number of the organ dedicated to its furtherance—*The Messenger of the Sacred Heart*. In this our century no cause is fully equipped that has not a special organ, be the cause political, religious, or industrial. The press and the post-office carries the knowledge of the devotion into the remotest districts ; sometimes knocking at the doors of the learned, the wealthy, and the influential ; sometimes at those of the poor, the unlettered, and the afflicted ; but bringing, oh ! such a beautiful message alike to all—a message from the adorable, human, living, Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ.

What Catholic could refuse to receive *The Messenger* (as it was beautifully, almost inspiredly, styled) *of the Sacred Heart* ? What Catholic heart could refuse to listen to a message from the Heart of Jesus ? We read that the monthly issue of this periodical led to a prodigious development of *The Apostleship of Prayer*. And who could doubt it ? The wonder would be if it were otherwise.

Then came a second notice and sanction of the Vicar of our divine Lord in 1866, when numerous indulgences were granted to the devotion by him. At the same time there came the best intelligence of all, that the League of the Sacred Heart had “ *received a definite organization, through the approval of the statutes by the congregation of bishops and regulars.* ”

The present holy Pontiff, even before he was Pope, also gave the devotion his approval, his blessing, and his support. In that very year of 1866, when it was declared a definite organization, he wrote, being then archbishop of Perugia, to the Central Director of Italy :—“ *The Apostleship of Prayer* is so beautiful a work, and unites so much fruitfulness with so much simplicity, that it assuredly deserves all the favours of ecclesiastical authority. I rejoice to see it established in my diocese, and I shall never tire of promoting it.” That was in 1866. We know how political matters were tending at that time in Italy, until a crisis came in 1870. Now, a bishop during that time would

surely look to the best ; nay, even to a miraculous means, if it could be found, of preserving his flock to religion, and religion to his flock. In a pastoral which the present Holy Father, who was still only archbishop of Perugia, wrote in the intermediate time, *i.e.*, in 1868, he speaks of it thus :—" The plentiful fruit which the Holy League has already produced, no less than its rapid extension, shows plainly how pleasing this association must be to our Lord."

Leo XIII. was scarcely a year on the throne when he perfected and confirmed the statutes ; and during the twelve years of his pontificate he has issued no less than eight successive briefs or rescripts, each conferring new and more abundant privileges and indulgences on the association : that is to say, a brief or rescript almost every year. This, surely, is abundant and superabundant sanction, and certainly no stinted advocacy. Authorized and advocated by such high authority, no one need have a dread in following or furthering its work.

The " simplicity and usefulness" of this organization will be considered in another paper.

J. CULLEN, S.J.

Liturgical Questions.

THE "QUARANT' ORE," OR FORTY HOURS' ADORATION.

" The prayer for forty hours together before the Blessed Sacrament, in memory of the forty hours during which the Sacred Body of Jesus was in the sepulchre, began in Milan about the year 1534. Thence it spread into other cities of Italy, and was introduced into Rome, for the first Sunday in every month, by the Arch-confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity of the Pilgrims (founded in the year 1548, by St. Philip Neri) ; and for the third Sunday in the month, by the Arch-confraternity of our Lady of Prayer, called *La Morte*, in the year 1551."

" The devotion of the Forty Hours was established for ever by

Pope Clement VIII. for the whole course of the year in regular continuous succession from one church to another, commencing on the first Sunday in Advent with the chapel in the Apostolical Palace, as appears from the Constitution, *Graves et diuturnae*, Nov. 25, 1592. This Pope was moved to establish this devotion by the public troubles of Holy Church, in order that day and night the faithful might appease their Lord by prayer before the Blessed Sacrament solemnly exposed, imploring there His divine mercy. He further granted holy indulgences to those who should assist at prayer during this solemn exposition. All this was afterwards confirmed by Pope Paul V. in the brief, *Cum felicitis recordationis*, May 10, 1606.”¹

In course of time some irregularities and abuses in connection with this solemn ceremony were allowed to grow up in various districts, notwithstanding the zeal and vigilance of popes and bishops. To put an end to these, and to secure uniformity, at least in the churches of the Eternal City itself, Clement XI. published, January 21, 1705, his famous Instruction—called after him the *Instructio Clementina*—by which he regulated, down to the minutest detail, everything connected with the devotion of the Forty Hours. This Instruction has the force of law in the City of Rome, and must, therefore, be exactly observed in all the Roman churches as often as this devotion takes place in them. Outside the city the Instruction has only a directive force;² but it is superfluous to remark that it is a highly praiseworthy thing to follow it wherever local circumstances and diocesan laws permit.

The indulgences³ attached by the Sovereign Pontiffs to

¹ *The New Raccolta*. English translation, authorized by the Congregation of Indulgences, page 106. Philadelphia, 1889.

² “Verbo dicam, eandem (scil. Instructionem) quoad urbem vim praeceptivam habere, quoad alias Ecclesias dumtaxat directivam.” Gardellini.

³ These indulgences are—(i.) “A plenary indulgence to all who being truly penitent, after confession and communion, shall devoutly visit any church, and pray there for peace and union among Christian Princes, for the extirpation of heresy, for the triumph of the Church, or for other favours, as the devotion of each one may suggest.”

(ii.) “An indulgence of ten years and as many quarantines for every visit made with true contrition and a firm purpose of going to confession. This indulgence was confirmed by His Holiness Pope Pius IX. by a Rescript of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, November 26, 1876 (and can be gained as often each day as the visit is repeated. Wapelhorst, n. 219). By a Rescript, May 10, 1807, Pius VII. declared that henceforth and for ever in the churches where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed all the altars are privileged during the time of the exposition.”—(*Raccolta*, page 107).

this devotion, were, like the Clementine Instruction, intended only for the city of Rome, and cannot, consequently, be gained anywhere else unless by virtue of a special privilege. Moreover, this privilege was at first granted only on condition that the exposition should continue uninterruptedly day and night, for the space of about forty hours; that it should be begun and ended with a solemn procession; and, in a word, that the Clementine Instruction should be substantially carried out. This discipline is now greatly modified. Hence we find that, in answer to the petition of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore,¹ the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* extended to all the dioceses of the United States the ordinary indulgences attached to the exposition in Rome, at the same time sanctioning the interruption of the exposition during the night, and dispensing with the procession at the will of the pastor of each church.²

The Blessed Sacrament should be exposed at the high altar, the drapery of which should be white, no matter what colour the office of the day requires. Relics should not be allowed to remain on the altar, nor images, except such as form part of the structure, and except also images of angels supporting candelabra.³ The altar-piece and any other paintings in the immediate vicinity of the altar should be covered with white hangings.⁴

On the altar and about it, twenty wax candles, according to the Clementine Instruction, should be kept lighting during the whole time of the exposition. Of these, eighteen should be on the altar and round the throne, while the remaining two, which should be of ponderous size, fixed in suitable candlesticks, should remain *in plano* in front of the altar,

¹ *Acta et Decreta*, n. 376.

² Wapelhorst, *ibi*. In Ireland, his Lordship the Most Rev. Dr. Woodlock, obtained from the same Congregation, in 1882, a Rescript granting a similar privilege to the Exposition of the Forty Hours in the churches in the diocese of Ardagh. By this Rescript the usual indulgences are granted, and permission given to replace the Blessed Sacrament privately in the tabernacle at night, and expose it privately in the morning. See Rescript and interesting correspondence between his Lordship and Cardinal Simeoni in the I. E. RECORD, Third Series, vol. iv., page 197, &c.

³ *Instr. Clemen.*

⁴ Martinucci, l. 2, c. 38, n. 107.

These details regarding the position and size of the candles are not regarded as obligatory even in Rome ;¹ still less, then, are they obligatory in other places.

With regard to the number and quality of the candles, the case is different. There is no doubt that this provision must be observed in Rome by virtue of the Instruction ; while outside of Rome the reverence due to the Adorable Sacrament requires that the altar of exposition should be always furnished with a plentiful supply of lighted candles, and that at least those on the altar and immediately about the throne should be of wax. A decree² of Innocent IX. permits solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament with so few as ten wax candles. But there should be, at least, this number. Indeed, there is hardly any church or parish so poor that it cannot afford to keep at least twenty wax candles burning during the few hours that this solemn ceremony lasts. The candles should be arranged as far as possible before the mass of exposition, and should be lighted before the consecration. During the time the candles are lighting, a priest or cleric, vested in soutane and surplice, should look after them.³ Even Regulars should wear a surplice over their habit when engaged about the altar.⁴

The cross remains on the altar as usual during the mass of exposition. During the mass of deposition it may or may not remain on the altar, according to the custom of each church or place. But at all other times it must be removed. The charts, also, must not be permitted to remain on the altar unless during mass. The Instruction lays down precise rules regarding the mass to be celebrated on each of the three days included in the Forty Hours. It supposes, however, that each mass will be celebrated solemnly ; that is, with deacon and sub-deacon, and all the other accessories of a solemn mass ; or in that sense, that it shall, at least, be sung by the celebrant assisted by a choir.⁵ But as in very

¹ Gardellini, *Instr. Clemen.*, sect. 6, n. 3.

² May 20, 1682.

³ *Instr. Clemen.*

⁴ Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 7, n. 2.

⁵ Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 15, n. 5.

many places in this country, and in others similarly situated, it is impossible to have either a solemn mass or a *missa cantata* on occasion of the Forty Hours' devotion, it will be necessary to indicate the modifications in the Instruction which these circumstances call for. We shall, then, point out—first, what the Instruction prescribes for those places where mass can be celebrated solemnly in the sense just explained; and afterwards, what analogy, the general principles of the Liturgy, and various decisions, prescribe for places where only a private mass can be celebrated.

I. WHEN MASS CAN BE CELEBRATED SOLEMNLY.

On the first and third days a solemn votive mass of the Blessed Sacrament should be said, and on the intermediate day also a solemn votive mass *pro pace*, or for such other necessity as the Pope or the bishop of the place may have ordered for the time.¹ There are, however, certain days whose offices are so highly privileged as not to admit of the celebration of a solemn votive mass even on such a solemn occasion as the devotion of the Forty Hours. These days, as defined by the Instruction, and by subsequent decisions, are:—1. Sundays and feasts of the first and second class. 2. Ash Wednesday, and the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of Holy Week.² 3. All the days within the Octaves of the Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost; and 4. The eves of Christmas and Pentecost.

On these days the mass of the day is celebrated, and under the same conclusion with its prayer is said the votive prayer of the Blessed Sacrament, or *pro pace*.³ All other commemorations are omitted, except that of an occurring Sunday or feast of double or semi-double rite.⁴ But even when such a commemoration as this is to be made, the votive prayer is said immediately after the prayer of the mass, and under the

¹ *Instr. Clemen.* Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 13.

² On the last three days of Holy Week the devotion of the Forty Hours is strictly forbidden.

³ *Instr. Clemen.*

⁴ S.R.C., 18 Maii, 1883, ad Episc. Marianopolitanus (apud Wapelhorst, n. 220) Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 12, n. 9. De Herdt, tom. 1, n. 45. Merati, p. 1, tit. 4, n. 44.

same conclusion.¹ In the mass of these days no other changes are to be introduced on account of the exposition. They are to be celebrated with or without the *Gloria* and *Credo*, and with a last Gospel other than the beginning of St. John, according to the rubrics general and special referring to them.²

Except on these days the votive masses as already mentioned are to be said. The votive mass of the Blessed Sacrament to be said is that which is found among the votive masses at the end of the missal. Within the Octave of Corpus Christi, however, the mass of the feast is said, with the sequence and only one prayer.⁴ The solemn votive masses on the first and third days admit no commemoration whatsoever, even of an occurring Sunday.⁵ The *Gloria* and *Credo* are said, the Preface is *de Nativitate*, and the last Gospel is always the beginning of St. John.

The mass *pro pace* admits the commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament only. This commemoration is said under the same conclusion with the prayer of the mass. In this mass, which is celebrated in violet vestments, the *Gloria* is always omitted; the *Credo* is also omitted, unless on Sundays; and the Preface, since there is none proper, is selected according to the ordinary rules. Hence, on week-days the Preface will be *de octava*, *de tempore*, or *de communi*; on Sundays, *de octava*, *de tempore*, or *de Trinitate*. Should Ash-Wednesday happen to be one of the three days, the Prayers, Preface, and *Pater Noster* are sung in the ferial tone, and the prayer *super populum* is said after the Post-Communions.⁶

II. WHEN MASS CANNOT BE CELEBRATED SOLEMNLY.

Here again, two cases are to be distinguished. Either the days of exposition or any of them admit of private votive

¹ Gardellini, *ibidem*.

² Wapelhorst, n. 2, 20.

³ Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 12, n. 15. Wapelhorst, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Idem, ibidem*.

⁵ "Idque etiam si incidat in Dominicam non solum in ecclesiis collegiatis, sed itam in aliis." Martinucci, l. 2, c. 38, n. 107. Wapelhorst.

⁶ S. R. C., *loc. cit.*

masses, or they do not.¹ In the former hypothesis a votive mass of the Blessed Sacrament should be celebrated on the first and third days, and on the intermediate day, a votive mass *pro pace*, or for any other necessity, according to the directions of the bishop of the place.

These masses, since they enjoy no privileges over ordinary votive masses, are subject to precisely the same rules in their celebration. The *Gloria* and *Credo* are always omitted, the last Gospel is the beginning of St. John, and at least three prayers must be said, while none of the prescribed prayers can be omitted.

In the latter hypothesis—that is, when a private votive mass cannot be said on one or more of the days of exposition—the mass of the day must be said with a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament. This commemoration must be omitted, however, on doubles of the first and second class on Palm Sunday and on the eves of Christmas and Pentecost.² Its place when made is after all the prayers prescribed by the rubrics, but before such as may be ordered by a bishop—*orationes imperatae*.³

All private masses celebrated in the church during the days of exposition, whether at the altar of exposition or at another, take a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament, subject to the limitations and regulations just mentioned.⁴ The bell should not be rung during the exposition, unless, perhaps, at the principal mass.⁵

At the altar of exposition only the mass of the first and third days, that is, the mass of exposition and the mass of reposition, as they are called, should be celebrated.⁶ There are two evident exceptions, however: one founded on a long-existing custom of celebrating at the altar of exposition; the

¹ Private votive masses are forbidden—1, on all Sundays and on feasts of double rite; 2, within the octaves of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost and Corpus Christi; 3, on Ash-Wednesday and on all the days of Holy Week; 4, on the eves of Christmas, Epiphany, and Pentecost; 5, on the Commemoration of All Souls.

² De Herdt, tom. 1, n. 73, 2.

³ *Ibi.*, n. 4.

⁴ *Ibi.*, n. 2.

⁵ *Instr. Clemen.*

Ibi.

other founded on necessity; namely, if there is not a second altar in the church.¹ The same is to be said of the distribution of communion as of the celebration of mass. It should not take place at the altar of exposition, unless sanctified by custom or justified by necessity.

Requiem masses are forbidden in a church in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, unless on the commemoration of All Souls, when violet vestments are to be used.²

THE FIRST DAY.

The mass of the first day is selected according to the directions just given. The ceremonies, until after the communion of the celebrant, are precisely the same as in an ordinary mass. Two large Hosts, however, are consecrated; one for the mass itself, the other for the exposition.

The preparations for the mass of exposition include, besides the things required for the mass, those also that are required for the procession—namely, a cope of the same colour as the vestments; a white humeral veil, no matter of what colour the vestments are; the processional cross, the monstrance, a second large Host, a second censer, candles for those who are to take part in the procession; four, six, or eight lanterns, if the procession is to go outside; the large canopy for the procession proper; and the small canopy, or *ombrellino*, which is extended over the celebrant, while carrying the Blessed Sacrament between the altar and the large canopy.

THE MASS.

When the celebrant has consumed the Precious Blood he places the chalice on the corporal, and the sub-deacon covers it with the pall. The deacon and sub-deacon then genuflect and change places, and again genuflect along with the celebrant. Meantime the master of ceremonies brings the monstrance from the credence to the epistle side of the altar, and hands it to the deacon. The latter removes the white veil, which is carried to the credence by the master of ceremonies or by an acolyte,³ and places the monstrance on the

¹ Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 12, 5.

² DeJHerdt, tom 1, n. 49.

³ Martinucci, l. 2, c. 38, n. 36.

corporal. He then fixes in its place the lunette holding the consecrated Host, and places the monstrance on the back part of the corporal, taking care that it faces outwards. All three now genuflect, and the sacred ministers change places, the deacon returning to the celebrant's left and the sub-deacon to his right. On their arrival they again genuflect, the sub-deacon uncovers the chalice, and the celebrant purifies the corporal at the place where the second Host rested. During the remainder of the mass the rules laid down for a mass in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed must be observed. The cruets, &c., are no longer kissed, salutations are omitted, and even the celebrant genuflects each time he comes to the centre of the altar or departs from it.

THE PROCESSION.

When the celebrant has finished reading the last Gospel, he goes to the centre of the altar accompanied by the sacred ministers, and all genuflect on one knee, and go by the lateral steps to the bench. Arrived at the bench, they remove their maniples, and the celebrant the chasuble in addition, in place of which he puts on a cope corresponding in colour with the other vestments.¹

The two thurifers now approach the celebrant, having their censers replenished with fire. When passing the centre of the altar they genuflect on both knees, and when they come in front of the celebrant they stand in single file—*alter post alterum*.² The celebrant, having assumed the cope, puts incense into the censers, but does not bless it, and all proceed in front of the altar, genuflect on both knees on the pavement, and, rising, kneel on the first step. In this position the celebrant incenses the Blessed Sacrament with three double swings, making, as the ministers also do, a profound inclination of the head before and after. The white humeral veil is now put on the shoulders of the celebrant, who, together with the deacon and sub-deacon ascends the steps. The deacon mounts the predella, while the others kneel on the

¹ While the ministers are at the bench, the charts, missal, and stand should be removed from the altar by the sacristan or an acolyte.

² Martinucci, *loc. cit.*, n. 51.

front edge. Having genuflected on the predella, the deacon takes hold of the monstrance with both hands, the right being towards the upper part of the stem, and the left under the foot, and the front of the monstrance being next himself. Holding it thus, he turns towards the celebrant, who inclines his head to the Blessed Sacrament, and, still kneeling, receives the monstrance in both hands covered with the ends of the humeral veil. The deacon having placed the monstrance in the hands of the celebrant, genuflects on one knee on the predella towards the Host in the monstrance, and immediately takes his place at the right of the celebrant. The latter with the sub-deacon rises, and both are accompanied on to the predella by the deacon. On the predella all three turn towards the people, the deacon and sub-deacon keeping their respective places at the right and left of the celebrant. As soon as they have turned round, the chanters intone the *Pange lingua*, and the procession moves off.

The sacristan or an acolyte will now take the small canopy, extend it, and hold it over the celebrant while he moves from the altar to the large canopy. Those who carry the large canopy will have it in position at his approach.

The procession, which forms part of the Forty Hours' Devotion, is supposed to be confined to the church.¹ It is, however, permitted to proceed a short distance outside the church, if the interior does not afford sufficient space.² When the procession is confined to the church it goes from the altar by the right, or gospel side, and returns by the left, or epistle side; but when it leaves the precincts of the church it proceeds direct from the altar to the door by the centre of the nave; and, having emerged from the door, it goes away by the right, returns to the door by the left, and reaches the altar again by the same path by which it came from the altar to the door.³

The procession is composed of lay confraternities, if there be any attached to the church; Regulars, should any take part in the ceremonies; and the secular clergy. When a

¹ *Instr. Clemen.*

² *Ibidem.*

³ Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 20, n. 16.

large number are to take part in the procession they should begin to leave their places at such a time as will enable the whole procession to be formed when the celebrant is ready to accompany it, or shortly after he is ready. With this object it is permitted to begin to form the procession any time after the consecration, or even before it, if necessary.¹

The lay confraternities walk at the head of the procession, each preceded by its own cross carried by one of its members, having on either hand one or two members with lighted torches.² If the Regular clergy who are present form one or more distinct bodies, they follow the laity, each Order having its cross borne in front of itself.³ The secular clergy occupy the rear, being next the Blessed Sacrament. In front of the secular clergy the cross of the church is borne by an acolyte or a sub-deacon, vested only in soutane and surplice. He is accompanied by two acolytes, bearing lighted candles or torches. After these follow the clergy, two and two, also carrying lighted candles, each in the outward hand. In front of the canopy there should be, at least, eight priests or acolytes; and if the procession is to go outside the church there should be on each side of the canopy two, three, or four acolytes, with lighted candles in lanterns, carried on staves. The canopy is borne by the senior priests, or, if need be, by the most worthy laymen.⁴ Under the canopy walks the celebrant,⁵ carrying the monstrance raised up, so that the Host is about the height of his eyes. He is accompanied on the right and left by the deacon and sub-deacon, and in front of him walk the twothurifers, turned towards the Blessed Sacrament, which they continue to incense during the whole time of the procession. The celebrant and sacred ministers recite alternately psalms or hymns.

¹ *Instr. Clemen.*, sect. 20, n. 1. Those who take their places in the procession after the Host has been put into the monstrance genuflect on both knees in front of the altar.

² Martinucci, *loc. cit.*, n. 60.

³ Gardellini, *loc. cit.*

⁴ Martinucci, *loc. cit.*, n. 62.

⁵ The celebrant of the mass of exposition should carry the Blessed Sacrament in the procession—unless in one case, namely, when the bishop of the diocese is present, to whom this privilege would then belong.

When the procession returns to the altar, the cross-bearer places the cross in some convenient place on the epistle side, the acolytes lay their candles on the credence, and the clergy either divide into two lines, between which the Blessed Sacrament is borne to the altar, all genuflecting as the canopy approaches; or, without making any reverence to the altar, they return to their places in choir; and here also they kneel at the approach of the Blessed Sacrament.¹

The large canopy is borne only to the entrance to the sanctuary, whence it was carried at the beginning of the procession. As soon as the celebrant emerges from beneath it the small canopy is held over him until he reaches the altar. Those who carried the large canopy having consigned it to the persons who are charged with removing it, receive lighted candles, and kneel in a semicircle inside the sanctuary, if in surplice; but outside the rails, if only in secular dress.²

Having arrived at the altar steps, the celebrant places the monstrance in the hands of the deacon, who receives it kneeling on the pavement. The deacon, having received the monstrance, rises from his knees, and, without turning towards the altar, waits until the celebrant has adored the Blessed Sacrament. He then ascends the altar, and places the monstrance on the throne prepared for it, genuflects on one knee on the predella, and kneels on the lowest step at the celebrant's right.

The chanters immediately intone the *Tantum ergo*, and at *Genitori*, the celebrant—from whose shoulders the humeral veil should have been removed as soon as he gave the monstrance into the hands of the deacon—and the sacred ministers rise, and the former puts incense into the censer, which is presented by one of the thurifers, but does not bless it.

Again all kneel on the first step, and the celebrant, having received the censer from the deacon, who offers it without kissing the chains or the celebrant's hands, incenses

¹ Martinucci, *loc. cit.* n. 67.

² Bauldry, *apud* Baldeschi.

the Blessed Sacrament with the usual number of swings, and with the usual inclinations.

The hymn is not followed by the versicle *Panem de coelo*, &c., but immediately by the Litany of Saints, which is sung by two chanters, kneeling in the middle of the choir, the choir singing the responses. At the end of the psalm which is placed after the Litany, the celebrant sings the versicles. At *Dominus vobiscum* he rises, sings the prayers, standing with his hands joined, and at the end of the prayers again kneels, sings the versicle *Domine exaudi*, &c. The chanters then sing *Exaudiat nos*, &c., and the celebrant adds in a subdued voice, *Fidelium animae*, &c. After a brief delay the clergy return to the sacristy, in the usual order, making a double genuflection in front of the altar. The celebrant and sacred ministers remain uncovered until they get beyond the view of the Blessed Sacrament.

If for any reason there cannot be a procession, none of the other ceremonies are to be omitted. Hence when mass is finished, the celebrant assumes the cope as usual, puts incense into one censer, and coming in front of the altar genuflects on both knees, as do also the deacon and sub-deacon, if a solemn mass has been celebrated. Then kneeling on the first step he incenses the Blessed Sacrament. The monstrance is placed on the throne by the deacon, by another priest in surplice and stole, or, in defect of either, by the celebrant himself. The *Pange lingua* is sung. At *Genitori* the Blessed Sacrament is again incensed, and the Litany and prayers are sung as above, or recited, if they cannot be sung.¹

THE SECOND DAY.

Wherever it is customary during this devotion to replace the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle at night and expose it again in the morning, both reposition and exposition may be accompanied with the singing of the *Pange lingua*, and the prayer *Deus qui nobis*, and the reposition by Benediction in addition, or they may take place without any special cere-

¹ Wapelhorst, Martinucci, Gardellini, &c.

monies, according to diocesan statutes and established customs.

The mass on the second day, according to the Clementine Instruction, should be a solemn votive *pro pace*, or for whatever other necessity the Pope or bishop may order for the time. The days on which this votive mass is permitted have been already pointed out, and full explanations given as to what mass is to be said in its place, as well on days which exclude a solemn votive mass as in circumstances which exclude a solemn mass of any kind. These explanations, therefore, need not be here repeated, though it may be useful to call attention again to one or two points in connection with the place and manner of celebrating this mass.

The mass of the second day should not be celebrated at the altar of exposition, nor even at the altar where there is a tabernacle containing the Blessed Sacrament.¹ Of course necessity, which recognises no law, and custom, the best interpreter of the law, justify a departure from this direction.² The mass *pro pace*, when it is said, requires violet vestments, excludes the *Gloria* always, and the *Credo*, except on Sundays. The bell is not rung during the mass whatever it may be.³

THE THIRD DAY.

The Blessed Sacrament is exposed early on the morning of the third day, as on that of the second, and preparations are made for celebrating mass at the altar of exposition.⁴ These preparations are precisely the same as those for the

¹ "Haec vero missa votiva sollemnis cantanda est in altari ab eo in quo fit expositio et ab eo in quo adest tabernaculum cum incluso Sacramento diverso." (*Inst. Clemen.*)

² Gardellini, *loc. cit.*, sect. 12.

³ Baldeschi, Martinucci, *loc. cit.*, n. 23.

⁴ Martinucci (*loc. cit.*, n. 24) is of opinion that, whenever the Blessed Sacrament is placed in the tabernacle overnight, final reposition should take place in the evening, and not in the morning. This opinion even Wapelhorst seems to adopt. It is, however, merely an *opinion*, and one, moreover, for which there would seem to be no foundation in analogy or in custom.

mass of the first day, except that on this occasion there is no second Host, and no monstrance to be prepared. For the procession on this day the same preparations are made as for the procession on the day of exposition.

The mass is selected according to the directions already given, and is celebrated with all the ceremonies proper to a mass sung or said in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed.

After finishing the last Gospel, the celebrant and sacred ministers genuflect on the predella, and proceed to the bench, where the celebrant exchanges the chasuble for a cope, and all lay aside their maniples. Incense is not put into the censers, as on the first day. Instead, the celebrant having assumed the cope, all go at once to the front of the altar, make a double genuflection on the pavement, and rise to kneel on the first step.

Immediately the two chanters begin the Litany, which is continued by them and the choir alternately, as on the first day. During the Litany, or before it, if necessary, the procession is formed, all genuflecting on both knees to the Blessed Sacrament.

After the versicle *Domine exaudi orationem meam*, and before *Dominus vobiscum*, the celebrant and ministers rise, the twothurifers approach, and incense is put into both censers without any blessing. The celebrant and ministers again kneel, and the former incenses the Blessed Sacrament as usual. The humeral veil is now put on the shoulders of the celebrant, who, with the sub-deacon, rises, ascends the steps, and kneels on the edge of the predella. The deacon goes up with them, but does not kneel. Instead, he goes up to the predella, genuflects, but so that he does not turn his back on the celebrant, takes down the monstrance from the throne, and places it on a corporal spread on the middle of the altar. He again genuflects, and places the monstrance in the hands of the celebrant according to the directions given for the procession of the first day. The celebrant having received the monstrance in both hands, which should be covered with the ends of the humeral veil, ascends the predella in company with the sacred ministers, and all turn

towards the people. The chanters intone the *Pange lingua*, and the procession begins to move.

This procession is in all respects similar to that of the first day. The same rules, therefore, as to precedence, among those who take part in it, the limits within which it is to be confined, the direction in which it is to set out and return, and, in a word, as to its minutest detail, are to be followed in this as in the former. When, after the return of the procession, the deacon has placed the monstrance on the altar, the *chanters* begin the *Tantum ergo*. At *Genitori genitoque*, the Blessed Sacrament is incensed, and at the end of the hymn the versicle and response, *Panem de coelo*, &c. *Omne delectamentum*, &c., are sung, to each of which in paschal time and during the Octave of Corpus Christi an *Alleluia* is added.

The celebrant now rises, and sings, without *Dominus vobiscum*, the prayer *Deus qui nobis*, and the others which follow. Having finished the prayers, he again kneels, sings the versicles and responses alternately with the choir, until he comes to *Fidelium animae*, which he says in a subdued tone. The humeral veil is again put on his shoulders, and, assisted by the sacred ministers, he gives Benediction as usual. After the Benediction, the Blessed Sacrament is replaced in the tabernacle, and the ministers and choir leave the church in the usual order.

When there cannot be a procession, it alone is omitted; everything else is observed.

Documents.

DECREES OF THE CONGREGATION OF RITES.

SUMMARY.

1. WHEN A SIMPLIFIED DOUBLE CONCURS WITH A PRIVILEGED SUNDAY—WHICH SHOULD PRECEDE IN THE ORDER OF COMMEMORATIONS?
2. SHOULD THE SECOND VESPERS BE OF THE OCTAVE DAY OF CORPUS CHRISTI, ON THE EVE OF THE FEAST OF THE SACRED HEART?
3. SHOULD THE COLOUR OF THE VESTMENTS FOR THE FEAST OF THE SACRED HEART BE WHITE, WHETHER THE MASS BE *Egredimini*, WITH THE PREFACE OF THE NATIVITY, OR *Miserebitur*, WITH THE PREFACE OF THE CROSS.

NITRIEN.

Rmus Dnus Augustinus Roshovanyi Episcopus Nitrien. Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequentia Dubia pro opportuna declaratione humillime subiecit, nimirum :

Dubium I. An concurrente commemoratione festi ritus Duplicis simplici cum commemoratione Dominicae privilegiatae, huius commemoratio praecedere debeat alteram de festo Duplici simplici, vel viceversa?

Dubium II. An iuxta Decretum *Urbis et Orbis* diei 28 Iunii 1889, secundae Vesperae diei octavae Corporis Christi integrae de eadem octava fieri debeant; vel iuxta alias Decreta a S. Rituum Congregatione illae Vesperae integrae de sequenti festo Sacri Cordis Iesu dicendae sint, absque octavae Corporis Christi commemoratione?

Dubium III. An Sacra paramenta coloris albi in Missa de Sacro Corde Iesu adhibenda sint, tum in locis ubi Missa *Egredimini* cum Praefatione de Nativitate celebratur, tum reliquis in locis ubi Missa *Miserebitur* cum Praefatione de Cruce usurpari debet?

Sacra vero eadem Congregatio, exquisito voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, ita propositis Dubiis rescribendum censuit, videlicet :

Ad I. Affirmative ad primam partem; negative ad secundam;

Ad II. Affirmative ad primam partem; negative ad secundum;

Ad III. Affirmative. Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit die 15 Novembris 1890.

C. Card. ALOISI MASELLA, *Praef.*, S.R.C.

VINC. NUSSI, *Secretarius*.

SHOULD A PRIEST AT THE ALTAR, IMMEDIATELY BEFORE OR AFTER MASS, GENUFLECT DURING THE ELEVATION AT ANOTHER ALTAR OF THE CHURCH?

Accidit quandoque, ut statim post absolutam Missam unius Sacerdotis, in alia Missa fiat ab alio Sacerdote elevatio Sacramenti: tenetur ne Sacerdos, qui Missam explevit, expectare elevationis utriusque speciei finem, in quocumque altari fiat?

Resp. Rubricae Missalis leviora illa temporis momenta, quae intercedunt a fine Missae ad initium usque reditus in sacrarium, explicite non considerant; sed casus respiciunt solum, qui accidere possunt cum vel e sacrario ad altare, vel ab altare in sacrarium Sacerdos incedit. Nihilominus eadem ad casum applicanda est Rubrica, quae tractat de modo se gerendi Sacerdotis, antequam Missam immediate incipiat; idque, uti patet, ex paritatis ratione. Itaque Rubrica (*Rit. celebr. Tit. III, n. 4*) ait: "Celebrans... dicit... *In nomine Patris*, etc. Et postquam id dixerit, non debet advertere quemcumque in alio altari celebrantem, etiamsi Sacramentum elevet." Ergo, omnes communiter concludunt, omnique, ut patet, iure, antequam praefata verba pronuntiet, genuflectere debet tempore quo Sacramentum elevatur in alio altari: idem de fine dicas. At merito inquiritur, utrum genuflectere Sacerdos debeat, quocumque in Ecclesiae altari elevatio fiat. Sed negative respondemus, et ut genuflectat Sacerdos, seu celebraturus, seu qui iam celebravit, requiritur, ut vel e conspectu Sacramentum elevetur, vel saltem in

proximiori altari. Sane Rubrica de Sacerdote incedente sic se habet: "Si vero contigerit, eum transire ANTE altare maius... Si ANTE locum Sacramenti... Si ANTE altare, ubi celebretur missa, in qua elevatur, vel tunc ministratur Sacramentum, etc. (*Rit. serv. Tit. II, n. 1*):" tunc tantum, Rubrica exigit, ut Sacerdos genuflectat; ergo minime in aliis casibus, in quibus ANTE non transit. Eodem quoque sensu primam superius relatum Rubricam esse intelligendam, satis pariter liquet, seu ex communiter servata consuetudine, seu ex inconvenientibus, quae ex contraria praxi derivarent, maxime in amplioribus Ecclesiis. Ergo a pari in casu nostro, post scilicet expletam Missam, eadem est norma sequenda. Hinc de principio Missae agens cl. Zualdi, ait: "Si Sacramentum elevetur in altari proximiori antequam Missa incipiat, potest genuflectere in infimo gradu; imo convenit, si duo altaria inter sese nulla pariete separentur (*Caerem. Miss. priv. pag. 52 in nota*). Clarius autem Wapelhorst habet:" Si vero ante Missam, vel post eam, finito ultimo Evangelio, fiat elevatio in alio altari VICINO, utrumque genuflectit in infimo gradu, donec ibi calix depositus fuerit (*Compend. Sacr. Liturg. pag. 82, § 51, n. 2*)." Adeo ut, proinde, altaris proximitas plus minusve, omnino requiratur, ut Rubricarum vi Sacerdos, seu ante initium, seu post finem Missae, debeat genuflectere, si in illo elevetur Sacramentum. Id autem ita esse intelligendum, ut Sacerdos ad expletam utriusque speciei elevationem utroque genuflectus stare debeat, adeo res patet, ut nec innuere necessarium censeamus.¹

¹ Taken from the *Ephemerides Liturgicae*.

Notices of Books.

ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA AND THE EARLY JESUITS. By Stewart Rose. London: Burns and Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1891.

IN 1870 Mr. Stewart Rose published the first edition of this work, which was then received rather coldly by critics. The public, however, must have liked it better than their would-be guides, for in less than twelve months a second edition was called for. The present is an *edition de luxe*, and, according to the author, is so much improved "that it may be called a new life." But this statement, though coming from one who should know, we are not bound to accept in its entire fulness. That there are improvements, and great improvements, we fully admit; but these are rather in the form than in the matter of the work; rather in little details than in the substance of the narrative. The illustrations are, of course, a new feature; so is the division into chapters; several additional letters of St. Ignatius—not indeed of absorbing interest—are added, and a few queer expressions used in the first edition have been changed or expunged; but the narrative, taken as a whole, remains substantially what it was.

In connection with the illustrations no expense has been spared. They are intended to serve as a kind of small panorama of the saint's life, and are, therefore, for the most part "restorations." Cities and churches, palaces and piazzas, convents and colleges, and common dwelling-houses are shown, not as they are at present—if they exist at all—but as they were in the time with which the narrative is concerned. These restorations have been made by one who is at once an eminent archæologist and an eminent artist. They are, therefore, of great value from an historical and archæological point of view, while they excite the interest and stir the imagination of even the ordinary reader. The portraits are few—too few, indeed, for the curious reader. Among them are two of St. Ignatius—one of his mail-clad youth, wherein he seems prepared to conquer the world with spear and shield; the other of his old age, when he had laid the world at his feet with the arms of prayer and self-denial. But the original of neither one nor other of these was taken

during the saint's lifetime, nor indeed does there exist any portrait painted during his lifetime. Immediately after he died, casts of his face were taken, and with the aid of these, assisted by suggestions from Father Ribadeneira, Alonso Sanchez de Coello, an eminent Spanish artist painted the portrait, of which the second of those just mentioned is a copy.

Of the narrative itself we do not purpose to say much. It has been, even in its present form, before the public for more than twenty years. Besides there is hardly a saint in the calendar, if we except the immediate followers of our Lord, the outlines of whose life are so universally known, as are those of St. Ignatius. But for those who have not yet read Mr. Stewart Rose's work, many interesting details about the saint and his companions remain to be learned. The narrative has all the dramatic interest of a powerful novel. Ignatius is the hero; his personality is kept constantly in the foreground, and we follow him with the greatest interest through the exciting, and in some cases almost incredible, scenes of his extraordinary life.

Ignatius, or Iñigo—for this is the name he received in baptism—spent the time of his youth at the Court of Ferdinand, King of Spain, where—

“He was trained with other young lords of his own age in all the knightly exercises, Don Antonio Manriquez, the Duke of Najera, kinsman and warm friend of the Loyola family, taking charge of his education. He caused him to take lessons in fencing daily, taught him the art of war, and along with this made him acquire the skill in writing and speaking, held in those days to furnish ‘the two wings of letters and of war’ which were to lift him up to the summit of honourable distinction whereto his thoughts aspired. According to the usage of the time, he devoted himself to the service of a noble lady, whose name in after days never passed his lips. The saint, indeed, never adverted to this passage in his life except very slightly, and then only to characterize the whole affair as a piece of wordly vanity; yet this much he said of the lady in question to Gonçalves, that she was not a countess nor a duchess, but of a rank more exalted than either—a lady of very illustrious and high nobility.”

This lady, according to our author, was Juana or Juanita, daughter of Ferdinand I. of Naples, who with her widowed mother, sister of Ferdinand of Spain, was then at the Spanish court. Mr. Rose, with a turn for romance which he frequently

displays, takes leave of this interesting princess in the following manner :—

“ We can find afterwards no mention of the Princess Juanita, and may conjecture as we please from the silence of history that she remained unmarried from some memory of her illustrious lover ; or, incited perhaps by his example, took shelter in the obscurity of a religious life.”

The description of Ignatius, the soldier, is interesting :—

“ He was generous, high-spirited, an honourable lover, a loyal courtier, well versed in every branch of knightly education ; with something too of taste in his handling of the pencil and the pen. He loved splendour, and new devices for display or amusement ; he liked to show himself in the saddle, managing with equal dexterity the jennet or gineta used in the tourney or the ring, and the heavy war horse which bore him with his lance into the field. He followed the war, says Padre Garcia (but without saying in what quarter), and gained himself a name that seemed to promise him the highest place in military honours ; he made himself beloved by the soldiers ; he respected the churches and convents, and all consecrated things ; and once defended a priest who was in considerable danger against a ‘ streetful,’ as he termed it, of men. He was scrupulous in speaking always the strictest truth, holding that as strictly indispensable to true nobility ; his words were ever guarded and modest, and such as a lady might have heard ; he was master of his wrath, and never drew his sword on slight occasions ; he thought it unworthy of his nobility to assert a right of precedence ; more than once he had appeased dissensions among the soldiers, even at his own personal risk, and averted mutiny in the field ; impetuous and quick to resent an insult, he was equally ready to forgive ; and the gift of influencing men’s minds, which was afterwards so remarkable in him, showed itself amongst his companions whether in the camp or court. He was short of stature, but he was active, lithe of limb and light of heart ; easily moved to mirth ; his complexion olive ; his hair very black, glossy and clustering ; his features well formed ; his forehead high ; his countenance so expressive and varying that no painter could ever make a true portrait of him. His dark eyes had the deep lustre of the south ; and to the close of his life their eloquence could command, console, and speak the liveliest sympathy, even when he did not utter a word. We hear often in his after life, from persons not among his followers, of the power of those marvellous eyes—then seldom raised from the ground except to gaze on heaven, but fraught with a persuasiveness exceeding that of language.”

Ignatius, as everyone knows, was wounded at the siege of

Pampeluna, or Pamplona, as Mr. Rose writes it ; but it is not so universally known that the town itself had been actually surrendered to the French prior to the engagement in which Ignatius received the wound. The officers in charge of the defence of the walls, despairing of being able to hold them against the overwhelming numbers of French soldiers without, and the citizens within, who strongly sympathised with the besiegers, had drawn off their soldiers and evacuated the town, notwithstanding the earnest protests of Ignatius against what he deemed a cowardly and dishonourable retreat. He himself, scorning to purchase safety at the price of honour, retired to the citadel, and by word and example so fired the commandant and the little garrison with his own enthusiasm, that they bade defiance to their foes, and prepared to defend to their last breath the charge entrusted to them. What follows is thus told by Mr. Rose :—

“ Ignatius, seeing himself and those around him in immediate danger of death, prepared to meet it as devout Catholics have often done when no priest was near, by making his confession to a comrade in arms, a gentleman with whom, he said, he had often fought. Then he addressed the officers and men ; he represented to them how much better was an honourable death than a cowardly capitulation ; he reminded them of the duties of a loyal soldier, and the glory that crowns an heroic sacrifice. The attack on the fortress and the defence were equally obstinate. The French, endeavouring to effect a breach in the walls directed the fire of their batteries against a quarter where Ignatius was combating with desperate valour, when a stone detached from the wall by a cannon-shot struck him on the left leg, and the ball itself by a fatal rebound shivered the right. Under these two blows he fell, and with him sank the courage of the garrison. On the same day, Whit-Monday, May 20th, 1531, the French made their entrance into the citadel.”

This was the turning-point in the life of Ignatius Loyola. He had fought his last fight with the arms in the use of which he had been trained from his childhood ; he had offered his last sacrifice on the altar of ambition. But he was not to cease to be a soldier ; for, with prayer and preaching as his arms, having Christ as his King, and the Church his lady-love, he was destined to wage unceasing, unrelenting, and successful war against Satan and sin, the implacable enemies of the human race. His wound occasioned a long and painful illness. Twice was his broken limb badly set. Once it was rebroken, and when it healed again, a protruding bone had to be sawed off. But the intense pain

caused by these operations, and the wasting fever which supervened, Ignatius bore without complaint or murmur. God visited him in his suffering; grace inundated his soul; he yielded to its sweet influence; scales, as it were, fell from his eyes; and he beheld how despicable, in comparison with the friendship of Almighty God, is the friendship of kings, or all the honours kings can bestow.

Then follow the pilgrimage to Montserrat, and the ten months' sojourn at Manresa. These ten months formed the saint's novitiate. But they were more than a mere novitiate. For not only was he himself thoroughly purified and sanctified, and his mind illuminated with the clearest knowledge of divine things, but he composed, though well-nigh illiterate, a book which has influenced the world more than any other mere human production has done. It is open to question, however, whether the "Spiritual Exercises" of St. Ignatius is a mere human production. But we must stop, or we shall be accused of wishing to write a biography of the saint ourselves; yet we cannot stop without pointing out that Mr. Rose's work is not a mere life of St. Ignatius. It is what its title bespeaks, and in its pages we find sufficiently detailed accounts of the earlier Fathers of the Society, particularly of the noble band that first rallied round Ignatius. The visit to Ireland, at the request of the Pope of Salmeron and Brouët, is described. They arrived in Ireland from Scotland in the beginning of Lent, 1542, and, having spent thirty-four days traversing the island, they returned, in obedience to the orders of Paul III., to whose ears had come the fact that confiscation of property and death were threatened against anyone who should give them food or shelter. Robert Waucop was then Archbishop of Armagh, but, owing to the savage persecution of the Catholics in Ireland by Henry VIII., had taken refuge in Rome. Though blind from childhood, he was an eminent theologian and man of letters. Having heard from the returned envoys the frightful sufferings the poor Irish had to endure for their faith, he instantly resolved to return, and suffer and die with his flock.

"But the Pope would not consent to this; he sent him, confiding in his remarkable endowments, to Germany with his Legate, and afterwards Waucop assisted at the Council of Trent. He must have been a man of rare ability, since his blindness had not hindered him from professing divinity at Paris. He ever loved and venerated the Society of Jesus, and died at Lyons on November 10, 1551, at their college."

THE INTERIOR OF JESUS AND MARY. Translated from the French of the Rev. J. Grou, S.J. Edited by Rev. S. H. Frisbee, S.J. London: Burns & Oates.

WE welcome this new and improved edition, in two handsome volumes, of the well-known work, *The Interior of Jesus and Mary*, by Fr. Grou. This book has continued to maintain its hold on pious souls who feel naturally drawn to know better and better Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. As a proof of the appreciation in which it has been held, it is only necessary to state that since it was first published, in 1815, more than *twenty* editions have been published in French; and it has been translated from French, in which it was originally written, into almost every European language.

The work may be briefly described as a series of readings on the life and virtues of our Blessed Lord and of His holy Mother. Pious souls who live in religious communities will find it to be an excellent book for spiritual reading, and thoughtful people in the world cannot easily meet with a book which will attract them more surely to the study of the life of Him whom to know and to imitate is life eternal.

It is important to explain that the present is a much improved edition. The work was originally composed in French for the help and direction of a saintly lady, Miss Weld, of Lullworth Castle; but the first and many succeeding editions were printed with many inaccuracies, and from an unrevised manuscript. In the sketch of the life of Fr. Grou, which prefaces the present edition, we are told that he had found that his penitent, Miss Weld, had a special attraction to imitate the Blessed Virgin in her interior dispositions, and as a help to her he composed *L'Interieur de Marie*. Finding that she corresponded generously to the design of our Lord, and desiring to confirm her in her vocation, he next composed for her *L'Interieur de Jesus*, which he finished in 1794. Some time after he asked for the manuscript, and made a copy in his own handwriting, introducing many improvements. This done, he returned the first manuscript to Miss Weld. The second was found among his manuscripts after his death.

Miss Weld loaned her copy to a French lady, who, with the permission of the former, copied it for her own use. Returning to France, she carried her precious manuscript with her, and thinking the interest of God and the good of souls demanded that she should not keep so great a treasure for herself, she had it published, unknown to Miss Weld, at Paris, in 1815. This edition

had been made with too little care for publication ; but its chief defect was, that it was a reproduction of the first manuscript of the author, and not the second, which he had revised and considerably improved. . . .

In 1847 Miss Kennelly, a religious of the Ursuline Community of Blackrock, near Cork, translated *L'Interieur de Jesus et de Marie* into English. This translation was made from one of the earlier editions, and is, therefore, free from many of the faults which have disfigured the French stereotyped editions. It is a new edition of this work which is now presented to the public.

ASCETICAL WORKS OF ST. ALPHONSUS. New York :
Benziger Brothers.

THE Centenary edition of all the ascetical works of St. Alphonsus, which was begun a few years ago, is now complete, and has been issued from the press of Benziger Brothers in a style worthy of the occasion. There are eighteen volumes in all, including such works as *The Selva*, *The Divine Office*, *The True Spouse of Christ*, *Sermons for Sundays*, *Preparation for Death*, *Glories of Mary*, *The Holy Eucharist*, &c., &c., and all his smaller treatises collected into one volume.

In looking over this library of ascetical books, it cannot but occur to one as simply marvellous how any one man could find time to compose and write so many books, and yet we know that all these works represent little more than his half hours of mental relaxation, when the saint turned aside from his active missionary labours, or deep absorbing study necessary for the composition of his great work on moral theology. Here we can realize how well he kept his promise never to waste a moment.

The ascetical works of St. Alphonsus cover the whole field of this department of study ; and, owing to their character for solid information and genuine simplicity, there are few, if any, books which we would more strongly recommend to priests and people. The priest will find in them, moreover, a great mine of instruction for the guidance of all classes of penitents, as well as for use in his Sunday sermons. We commend this Centenary edition of the ascetical works of St. Alphonsus to the attention especially of young priests and students.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S WORKS. London: Longmans,
Green & Co.

THE readers of the I. E. RECORD will be pleased to learn that a new and cheap edition of Cardinal Newman's chief works is

issuing from the press. They form a large part of the "Silver Library" which is being published by Longmans, Green and Co., and which is so called from the silver lettering on the cover of each volume. The size is crown octavo, and the type and paper are the very best. The price of each volume is 3s. 6d.

It is obviously unnecessary to write in praise of the literary excellence or varied learning of the great Cardinal's works. We have only to strongly recommend any of our clerical readers who may not have yet secured them to take advantage of the present issue, and he will be amply repaid for his moderate outlay by the store of reading—the most delightful and improving—which he will have laid by for the long winter evenings.

The following are some of the works which have been already published :—*Apologia pro vita sua* ; *Callista* ; *Loss and Gain* ; *Historical Sketches* ; *Essays, Critical and Historical* ; *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* ; *The Arians of the Fourth Century* ; *Verses on Various Occasions* ; *The Idea of a University defined and illustrated* ; *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (8 vols.) ; *Difficulties felt by Anglicans* ; *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* ; *Grammar of Assent* ; *Biblical and Ecclesiastical Miracles, &c., &c.*

TRACTATUS DE ACTIBUS HUMANIS. Auctore G. J. Walsh, S.T.D., &c. Dublini: Browne & Nolan.

As we are about to go to press with the October Number of the I. E. RECORD, an early copy of the second edition of the *Tractatus de Actibus Humanis*, by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, has been sent to us.

When this work appeared a few years ago we gave our opinion of its merits at considerable length, and our estimate of its worth has been fully borne out by the rapid sale of the 1,500 copies which composed the first edition. Now a second edition has been issued at the urgent and repeated appeals of the Theological Colleges, whose students have been greatly inconvenienced by the difficulty of securing a copy of the first edition.

The same reason which has restrained us from writing a word of praise of Cardinal Newman's works, in our notice of the new edition, is full as strong in the case of the *Treatise on Human Acts*, by the Archbishop of Dublin. Amongst theological students the *Tractatus de Actibus Humanis* is already recognised as a classic, just as the books of the great Cardinal are in their own order.

We have only to note that the new edition is printed in larger

type and better style than the first, and is most creditable, for its accuracy and form, to the printers, Messrs. Browne & Nolan.

SCOTT'S "ROKEBY." With Notes, &c. By W. F. Bailey, B.A.
Dublin : Browne & Nolan.

For Intermediate students it will be enough to announce that in the Intermediate School Texts, published by Browne & Nolan, Dublin, is now included *Rokeby*, edited and annotated by Mr. Bailey.

The "Intermediate School Texts" have been year by year increasing in popularity ; and as for the editor of *Rokeby*, it is only necessary to remind our readers that he is the same W. F. Bailey who has already edited for the same series of texts, Goldsmith's *Traveller*, Grey's *Elegy and Odes*, Lockhart's *Life of Napoleon*, Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, &c.

Rokeby is prefaced by a Life of Scott, and enriched, in addition to the footnotes, with an appendix and a complete map, in which every place mentioned in the text is identified.

SERMON DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF THE CONSECRATION OF MAYNOOTH COLLEGE CHURCH. By the Most Rev. Dr. Healy, Coadjutor Bishop of Clonfert.
Dublin : Browne & Nolan.

It happens so rarely that a sermon to which one has listened with great pleasure is capable of evoking the same feelings when calmly read over in print, that we confess to taking up the published copy of the Most Rev. Dr. Healy's Maynooth *Sermon* with a certain reluctance. We were amongst those privileged to hear the sermon when delivered, and it was our opinion then, and the opinion of those with whom we spoke, that it was worthy of the occasion, which was certainly the greatest that has been presented to a pulpit orator in Ireland within the century. All the Bishops of Ireland, and some from America and Australia, were present, with representative priests who came as delegates from every diocese in Ireland, and all assembled in the great National College, and in a chapel which for its exquisite beauty is a credit to the country.

Well, we have read over the *Sermon* in its neat pamphlet form, and we confess that we have done so with no less pleasure, and with, perhaps, more profit than when we heard it delivered. We are greatly pleased that the Bishop has yielded to the demand for its publication, for it would be a loss to let so beautiful a specimen of highest pulpit oratory die with the day.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

NOVEMBER, 1891.

LEO XIII. AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.—I.

“RERUM NOVARUM.”

IT is a custom with many writers of no mean standing to exalt to the sky the superior intelligence and industry, and the greater productive capacity of the Teutonic races, to the disparagement of the nations outside the circle of these privileged sons of progress. But a strange problem stares writers of this class in the face to-day as they pen their panegyric. Precisely from the chosen nations of modern advancement comes the present cry of almost hopeless perplexity amid the social and economic difficulties of our time. From England, and America, and from Germany, rise the loudest sounds of unending labour-war—from these same we hear of the greatest poverty in spite of all their teeming wealth, of the greatest oppression and misery in spite of boasted liberty.

The problem before us, baptized “the social question,” is world-wide, no doubt; yet, nowhere is the fatal law of modern progress, which our Holy Father simply and comprehensively enunciates as “*divitiarum in exiguo numero affluentia, in multitudine inopia*,” to be seen so strikingly exemplified as in the case of those nations which have surrendered themselves most completely to material prosperity, and appear to superficial observers to be the favoured sons of heaven:—

“Unfortunately it still remains true [writes Mr. Chamberlain] that in the richest country of the world the most abject misery

exists side by side with luxurious profusion and extravagance. There are still nearly a million persons in the United Kingdom who are in receipt of parish relief, and as many more who are always on the verge of poverty. In our great cities there are rookeries of ignorance, intemperance, and vice, where civilized conditions of life are impossible, and morality and religion are only empty names. In certain trades unrestricted competition and the constant immigration of paupers from foreign countries have reduced wages to a starvation level; while there are other industries—as, for instance, shipping and railway traffic—where the loss of life is terrible, and the annual butcher's bill is as great as in a serious war.”¹

It is true that “the utilization of steam and electricity, the introduction of improved processes and labour-saving machinery, the greater subdivision and grander scale of production, the wonderful facilitation of exchanges, have multiplied enormously the effectiveness of labour;”² and that consequently, there is a greater *absolute* number who enjoy improved conditions of life. Nevertheless these gains are far from general; and there seems room to question whether the *proportion* elevated by the benefits obtained from the prodigious increase in wealth-producing power, which has marked the present century, may not be incredibly smaller than that of those who have been depressed.

“The new forces [says Henry George] do not act upon the social fabric from underneath . . . but strike it at a point intermediate between top and bottom. It is as though an immense wedge were being forced, not underneath society, but through society. Those who are above the point of separation are elevated, but those who are below are crushed down.”³ Wherever the new forces are anything like fully utilized, large classes are maintained by charity, or live on the verge of recourse to it; amid the greatest accumulations of wealth, men die of starvation, and puny infants suckle dry breasts; while everywhere the greed of gain, the worship of wealth, shows the force of the fear of want. The promised land (*i. e.*, of *material* happiness) flies before us like the mirage. The fruits of the tree of knowledge turn as we grasp them to apples of Sodom that crumble at the touch.”⁴

¹ *North American Review*, May, 1891.

² Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*, page 1.

³ *Ibid.*, pages 4 and 5.

⁴ The value of George's remedy I may be allowed to examine by the light of the Encyclical in a future paper.

This association of poverty with progress, of squalid misery with luxury, of huge percentages on capital with the smallest possible remuneration of labour, the black wretchedness of over-crowded cities with mansions and villas, of sleek contentment and refinement with struggling toil and degradation—all this forms a cancer that eats away the very heart of our civilization. No wonder that “the momentous seriousness of the present state of things just now fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes—all are occupied with it, and there is nothing which has a deeper hold on public attention.” “All agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found and quickly found.” (*Encyclical*.) Yes, truly, for this is “the riddle which the sphinx of fate puts to our civilization, and which not to answer is to be destroyed.”

It is a hopeless folly on the part of “exploiteurs” and interested optimists, with smiling self-satisfaction, to declare themselves and the nations out of the reach of calamity, on the slippery pretext that this distemper, which, is now threatening the very life of society, is common to all times and to all countries. Undoubtedly other times have had their social questions, and other lands are distracted as well as our own by social antagonism and social danger. But between the past and present of the problem there is an essential difference. Under the old regime master and man were bound together by an identity of interests; the patron went forth to the combat supported by his workmen and dependents. Now he has to face them armed against him. The “craft-guilds,” composed of masters and men, which of old unified trades and industries, have been swept away, and have given place to “trades unions,” made up of men violently hostile to their employers, and to associations of capitalists who forget their obligations to the employed. Formerly, too, there was struggle, perhaps even violence and bloodshed; but, then, peace came at length to the workshop, bringing *some* period of healing calm. Now-a-days the battle is unceasing, and divides not workshop against workshop,

but man against master—employer against employed—sundering those who should join hands as brothers in the struggle of life.

The social question of our time is, in fact, the outcome of a five-fold revolution—the revolution in the State, in religion, in political economy, in machinery, and in the general tendency of mankind.

“Machinery has brought about disorder; a science of false economics has elevated disorder into an institution; the strife against God and against His Christ has precipitated it; new political liberty—the enfranchisement of labour—has rendered it powerful, nay, irresistible;¹ and the development of mankind has assigned to the ‘fourth estate’ a larger part on the stage of national and international life than it ever played before in the history of nations.”² “The elements of a conflict [declares our Holy Father] are unmistakable: the growth of industry, and the surprising discoveries of science; the changed relations of masters and workmen; the enormous fortunes of individuals and the poverty of the masses; the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population; and, finally, a general moral deterioration.”

To begin with, machinery has transformed the whole economic condition and order of the world. It has created increased facilities of communication, and has thus made the world one immense trading community. Production has been revolutionized, in consequence, by the minute division of labour, whereby “trades have become so specialized and localized, that one country, or perhaps one group of towns, produces the greater part of all the goods of a certain sort which are consumed throughout the world.”³ Large production is, therefore, the order of the day, and great armies of operatives, of both sexes and all ages, have been marshalled under the command and direction of a few intelligent *entrepreneurs*. Luxury and refinement of living have been carried to the maximum—

“So that not only are classes of goods multiplied almost indefinitely, but fashions and modes enter in, till *standard styles*

¹ Cf. “The Federation of Labour,” by H. H. Champion, *New Review*, 1880.

² Cf. *Le Moniteur de Rome*, May 24, 1891.

³ F. A. Walker, *Political Economy*, page 173.

almost disappear, each season bringing minute modifications of demand, which are not to be satisfied except by an exact compliance, even the colours and shades of one year becoming intolerable the next."

The consequences of such a state of things are—1st, that there is an incalculable increase of unskilled labour, or worse still, of only partially skilled, and therefore *immobile* labour;¹ 2nd, that there is an ever-widening gulf between capital and labour, between master and man—the latter being condemned to slave all his days with one set of muscles, to the deterioration of his general physique, and with the least possible use of his intelligence; the former being under the necessity, from the very purpose and end of his occupation, of sharpening and developing his intelligence to the utmost. 3rd. And last, but most direful of consequences, the toilers are at the mercy of the tender consideration of the *entrepreneur*, or of the whim of the luxurious consumers.

"Machinery has revolutionized the mode of production, the form of labour, the distribution of income and of property; it has destroyed the workshop to make room for the factory; it has by its immense productivity made the world into a market; it has created the despotism of capital on the one hand, and on the other the vast inorganic army of labour; and humanity has become, under its sway, as a mass of dust without cohesion, without unity. . . . This new order is the reign of the few—the resurrection of ancient Rome, where millions of slaves ministered to the pleasure and enjoyment of ten thousand wealthy lords, insolent in their riches."²

Let us write down in letters of red the words of our Holy Father:—

"Cum ipsa instituta legesque publicae avitam religionem exuissent, sensim factum est ut opifices inhumanitati dominorum effrenataeque competitorum cupiditati solitarios atque indefensos tempus tradiderit. . . . Huc accedunt et conductio operum et rerum omnium commercia fere in paucorum redacta potestatem; ita ut opulenti et praedivites perpauci prope servile jugum infinitae proletariorum multitudini imposuerint."

¹ *E. g.*, pitmen, stokers, firemen, dockers, &c.; by "Immobile Labour," I understand that which experiences an incapacity to exchange the kind of operation, or to migrate from one scene of work to another.

² Cf. *Le Moniteur de Rome*, as above.

In consequence of the almost infinitesimal division of labour, which has followed upon the introduction of machinery, trades are no longer in themselves attractive and interesting—no longer (in themselves) constitute an education for the great majority of those who engage in them. “The work of the living individual phantasy” is replaced in the general mass of workers “by the dull uniformity of a lifeless mechanism;”¹ room is no longer left for an honest pride in “something attempted, something done;” but a dull monotonous effort day after day in the performance of “some mechanical operation, which requires little thought and allows no originality, and which concerns an object in the transformation of which, whether previous or subsequent, the toilers have no part,”² renders our modern industry, in large part, little better than a system by which a superior minority is enabled to get the best results out of the slavery of the majority—a slavery that paralyzes a man’s best powers of mind and body. Then add to this, I will not say, the incidental injuries which, though actually suffered in this century by multitudes, especially women and children, at work on machinery, are yet in no essential connection with their employment; but the inevitable noise, the dust, the heat, and in particular “the injury to the nerves through the uniformity and monotony of the work, and the suppression of all variety in the play of the muscles.” These attendant evils of machinery—“aesthetic, psychical, physical injuries,” inseparable from our present system of production—are calculated to make one hesitate to join in the triumphant acclamations which greet this great age of discovery and invention—“our glorious nineteenth century.” And, besides, the trades that once were an education in themselves—as the smith’s trade of old—now develop the labouring man only in one portion of his bodily constitu-

¹ Devas, *Groundwork of Economics*, page 149. Of course I am not here called upon to make a comparative estimate of the good and evil of machinery. I am only showing that the influence of machinery is a necessary element to be taken into account in the examination of the *Res Novae*, which have created the Social Problem, and called forth the Encyclical.

² Here the psychological dictum “Idem semper sentire, et non sentire recidunt eodem” (Hobbes), finds, to my mind, striking exemplification.

tion; or, worse, they demand innumerable "hands" without heads—unskilled toilers—to wheel and to shovel, and to "feed" engines. A man with the *potentia* in him of as famous a workman as he who wrought the grand rood-screen preserved in the South Kensington Museum as the glory of the British blacksmith's art, may now-a-days be clad in scant *mutande* and leathern mask, as a puddler in one of the enormous ironworks of the land, or at best be allowed to develop his talents by manipulating a "bogie"-load of half molten iron to suit the stroke of the giant steam hammer.

While this is, in general, the effect of our industrial system on the toilers, the masters, managers, and directors of labour have a much superior fate. Their position and occupation oblige them to understand the working of the factories as a whole, and often the construction of each individual machine; and, more, they must make themselves acquainted with the developments and phases of trade and commerce, and must know the countries and provinces with which they have trade dealings. This all constitutes an intellectual education for the superior class, apart altogether from the refinement and mental training secured to them by their "social standing" and income.

Considering, then, the respective effect of our modern system on the toilers and on their masters, one cannot help perceiving the ever-increasing gulf between the employers and the employed. For, if we look back along the line of economic development, we shall see that at each stage in the evolution of things there has been, since the middle of last century, a tendency to exalt the superior or directive class materially and intellectually, and at the same time to depress the labouring classes mentally and physically by injurious kinds of employment, and by monotonous unfructifying repetition day after day of the same unvarying muscular operation.

Political economy here puts in its claim for the title of Guide of Society and Protector of Labour. But, unfortunately for all genuine science of economics, the results we have before us, of much at least of the early teachings of professed

economists, are sadly against its pretensions. I do not deny "the satisfactory results, which have attended the extensive recognition of the principles of economics in the commercial and financial codes of the country."¹ My contention is, that these advantages have been confined in their application: the few have been the gainers; and the many, if not losers, at all events have not been adequately and proportionately aided by this means in the struggle for life and decent existence. And, moreover, I would lay special stress on the Professor's declaration, that economic doctrines "have in recent years received some useful developments and *corrections*;" by which he implies that there was and is need for such corrections. Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, and Mill—the most distinguished names in the lists of the science—are by no means capable of supplying society with an infallible panacea for all human evils, even for all purely economic evils. Jevons and other moderate men have done much towards erasing the blots on the systems of their predecessors of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth.² Instead of devising a new method of practical doctrine to correspond with the new modes and conditions of production, economic science, left mostly in the hands of men inspired by the philosophy of Voltaire, Hume, Bentham, &c., advocated and introduced principles which have rendered the social action of the great mechanical triumphs of Watts, Stephenson, Nasmyth, destructive in the extreme. *Laissez-nous faire, laissez-nous passer*, cried the precursors and apostles of the French Revolution; and their cry, which meant ultra-individualism, or well-nigh complete independence for each member of society, *i.e.*, licence, was echoed and re-echoed in varying tones through Europe. Quesnay (1758), and Turgot (1769), and Condillac (1776), and J. B. Say (1803), Adam Smith (1776), and Malthus and Ricardo, and James Mill and J. S. Mill—these are the champions of "economic liberty," which too often—aye, generally—in State regula-

¹ Cairnes, *The Logical Method of Political Economy*, page 19, &c.

² Jevons' *State in Relation to Labour* deserves attention as following very closely the lines of the Encyclical in regard to State interference.

tions and in practice, has been a cloak for the licence of the wealthy and the dominant. The factory legislation of England from 1816 to 1833 was opposed by the generality of the writers and teachers of economics on the false principle of non-interference; and the tribe of superficial thinkers of our times are found to quarrel with the Encyclical on this same ground. Surely experience should have taught them reflection. For, there can be no doubt, the tendencies and doctrines of the so-called Manchester school of economists, aided and abetted by the teachings of Darwin and Spencer,¹ have resulted by direct causation, on the one hand in the erection of anarchism into a supposed scientific theory; and, by indirect influence, on the other—that is, by the natural operation of the principle of “reaction against exaggeration”—in the appearance of Karl Marx and Hyndman, and the whole system and organization of socialism. Thus the “proletariat” created by the vast expansion of modern industry, while thrust and trodden down, in the maddening scramble for place and pelf, into the squalor of poverty and of helpless wretchedness, is left, on the one hand, with an irony almost cynical, to the “free play of economic forces,” and to the “self-protecting power of labour;” and, on the other, it is invoked and armed by the ignorance of the wild enthusiast or the contrivance of the designing demagogue against all the rights and institutions of society.

Had the masses retained any portion of their Christianity, they might have been able to withstand the combined attacks of “liberalism” in economy and in philosophy. But, alas! the fragments of religion left among the lower classes by the Reformation have been largely swept away by generations of neglect, or else by the active agents of '89. An interesting though heart-chilling study is it to trace back the genealogy of the present social standards and ideas to the time when a lustful king and a godless queen robbed the English people of their noblest inheritance—

¹ Prince Krapotkin (*Nineteenth Century*, August, 1887) rests the “Scientific Basis of Anarchy” on the philosophy of Spencer.

the gift of the true faith. It is as evident as day-light that both the doctrine and influence of Protestantism have combined to destroy all the purest and loftiest ideals, which serve to raise the fallen race of man, and are imbibed by the people from religion. The teaching of Leo XIII., on more than one occasion, is plain enough. The reason of the present divorce of social and industrial life from religion, he declares, and of the consequent moral and material degradation into which the mass of the people have sunk, is to be found in some rude departure from the sublime ideals of Catholicism, in some violent separation from the traditions of the past; further, that this departure, this separation, is due to the ideas, the doctrine, and the practice of the Reformation; and, finally, that if the ills of society are to be healed, it must and can be only by a return to the spirit of the times when "the life of Jesus Christ, God and man, penetrated every race and nation, and impregnated them with His faith, His precepts, and His laws."¹

The first and essential idea of the Reformation was rebellion, the rejection of authority, the spurning of all restraint, the levelling of all restrictions. Private judgment, which means individualism or anarchy in religion, was the watchword of the Reformers; private judgment soon led to "liberalism," liberalism to thoroughgoing rationalism, and rationalism to complete infidelity and uncontrolled licence. The *laissez-nous faire*, *laissez-nous passer* of the Encyclopedists was all but the final expression of the spirit of the Reformation; the "rights of man," i.e., the complete independence of each individual, anarchy or licence—the revolution in all its Protean shapes and phases—these are all the legitimate children of the Reformation. And note that, simultaneously with this cry of *laissez-nous faire*, *laissez-nous passer* arose the malignant shout *écrasez l'infâme*, which has been dinned into the ears of the people as the supreme motive for civil and social activity ever since the gospel of the Reformation was revealed and promulgated

¹ Cf. *Rerum Novarum*, *Inscrutabili Dei ad init.*, *Quod Apostolici Muneris*, &c. See also Vat. Council, *De Fide Cathol.*

by the word of Voltaire and Rousseau. For more than a century false savants, impious philosophers, and writers without shame or modesty, have been employed and paid handsomely¹ to speak to the mob, and to tear from the hearts of the people, as far as in them lies, the belief in the immortality of the soul and the existence of God. "To hunt the Church from public life, from the school, from politics, from the hospital—to banish her out of sight and lock her up in the sacristy, to cast down the ramparts she has raised, to inoculate the world of labour with materialism and godless instruction—behold the aims and objects of those who now-a-days claim to guide and rule the world by their wisdom." And but yesterday (June 3rd)¹ the walls of Rome bore in large type a placard with the final and definite sentence of our modern leaders of the people, *non c'è più la religione*, "religion is no more." As a consequence, we seem to-day almost to be looking upon the fulfilment of the warning words, so oft repeated, of the Abbé Meric: "When you have driven God from the world, when you have torn from the breasts of the people their faith and the hopes of religion—that day you will witness such a storm of hatred let loose as you will not be able to control, and the torrent that bears away the ruins of our churches, will bear away also on its seething waters the *débris* of your wealthy mansions, given over into the hands of those whom you yourselves have armed and let loose."

We have, therefore, before us at the present time a problem, momentous indeed—a problem as old, it is true, in one phase or another, as civilization itself, but by causes innumerable assuming to-day a new and alarming aspect, and become more than ever hard to solve, yet pressing ever for instant solution. Luxury and poverty, capital and labour, these are the ends of the entanglement; and in the midst of all lie religion and morality bound and strangled. The moral and the material are so mutually intertwined, that if we would permanently extricate one from confusion, we must grasp and disentangle both. The conversion of England means

¹ Instance a certain "pensioned professor," whose pen is never so sharp and ready as when directed against aught savouring of religion.

² The substance of this paper was written early in June.

the redemption of the great masses of her people from the degradation, material and moral, to which they have been reduced by the principles of modern advancement introduced by the Reformation. Hence are needed, in order to undo the fell work of that movement, and to meet the requirements of the present crisis, men profoundly possessed by the divine ideal and fired by apostolic example ; earnest, unselfish, self-sacrificing, devoted to the poor, stern enemies of indulgence, gentle yet firm, men of prayer and mortification, men who will lay down their lives to restore the hope of the people ; the sacrifice of daily mass and the sacraments ; and at the same time men trained in sound knowledge of social and economic conditions, who can grapple with the material side of the problem ; can understand how to get filthy hovels, the fruitful abodes of crime and misery, swept away ; can rescue children and youths from degradation and vice, brand civilized slavery, and detect all the wily pretences of interested wealth for the maintenance or introduction of wrongful systems and measures ; and can show masters and men alike the folly of strikes, lock-outs, and unfair combinations. " Every minister of holy religion," proclaims the Vicar of Christ, " must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind and all the strength of his endurance ; . . . they must never cease to urge upon all men of every class, upon the high as well as the lowly, the gospel doctrines of Christian life ; *by every means in their power* they must strive for the good of the people."

We may legitimately conclude, then, that never before in all the long ages has the social question thus attacked with its menaces the very gates and foundations of civilized order. Everywhere the passion for revolution is abroad, stirring up the waters of society from their lowest depths ; states tremble beneath the shock of anarchy and socialism, the respective synonyms of disorder and tyranny ; industry seems in danger of complete dislocation ; the classes are marshalled against the masses, capital seeking to cast the chains of slavery on labour, and labour armed to the teeth against capital—an unholy and self-murdering conflict ! Confusion holds almost undivided sway, and men's minds, racked by dread expectation of evil soon to come, seek on all hands for aid and

guidance. Only three short weeks ago, I saw the troops of United Italy filling the streets of Rome ; the great question was being settled by the bayonets of the Bersaglieri and the revolvers of the Carabinieri ! Thirty thousand armed men, foot-soldiers and cavalry, are required to make the Eternal City safe to live in, and to maintain the tottering government. And on the same much-feared 1st of May the Lebel rifles of the French soldiery were employed with fatal effect on the unarmed crowd of labourers at Fourmies. The Revolution devours its own entrails !

While still the sounds and scenes of that May-day fighting at S^{ta} Croce in Gerusalemme were fresh in the memories of the inhabitants of Rome, and when the bayonets and revolvers had scarcely disappeared from the streets and the doorways of public buildings, a calm clear voice was heard speaking from the Vatican in accents of the deepest love and sympathy for the suffering and misguided masses, with words of warning to many, and with lessons of supremest import to all. The great problem, which has occupied the minds of so many of the wise ones of this age of enlightenment, is solved by the great Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, as far as human nature will allow the solution to be realized. “*Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*”

A. HINSLEY, B.A.

THE LOUGH DERG PILGRIMAGE.

IT is considerably more than a century since Dr. Pococke referred to Lough Derg as a “famous place of pilgrimage.”¹ From the lips of a Protestant bishop, such words afford a noteworthy testimony regarding this celebrated Irish sanctuary, and one which is all the more remarkable as it reaches us from the dark period of persecution when the Government had put forth all its strength to destroy every vestige of Ireland’s faith and sanctity. As a place of pilgrimage, it had, indeed, been famous centuries before the

¹ *Tour in Ireland*, page 72.

Tour in Ireland was penned. And, judging from the number of pilgrims who annually seek its secluded shores, it is evident that it still maintains its ancient character. Its position, sheltered within the secluded highlands of Donegal, was then remote. But in our day the railway line from Enniskillen, which skirts the picturesque shores of Lough Erne as it passes on to the Atlantic, has removed the chief difficulties of approach. A short drive from the pretty station at Pettigo, through some winding valleys and over a stretch of moorland, takes one to the shores of this historic lake. And here the islands which diversify its surface, and the sheltering hills—in many places picturesque with wood plantings, and gay with the bright tints of the flowering heather—burst upon the sight. The view is a very pleasing one; and yet the purple hill-slopes and the wooded islands seem to speak but of solitude. Nor is that feeling removed by the sight of the group of buildings which rise before you on “Station Island”—Ireland’s most historic sanctuary. If the soft pealing of the bell, which floats over the water from the island campanile, tells you of the near presence of your fellow-man, it tells you also that they are men who have sought the solitude of that island to devote some days to penance and to prayer. Though among the smallest and least picturesque, “Station Island” is, perhaps, by far the most interesting island in Lough Derg. Its area, not probably more than three roods, presents a perfectly barren surface, and thus contrasts very unfavourably with the wood-clad outlines of “Prior” and “Allingham” islands just adjoining, and with the fertile slopes of “Saints’ Island,” which rise above it on the opposite side. But the sharp rocks and broken shingle, which make its barren aspect all the more desolate, are the silent witnesses of the faith and piety of its pilgrims. To the pilgrim it is, indeed, holy soil; and in popular estimation in Ireland it has been regarded as such for many centuries. Do we not learn by a time-honoured tradition that our national apostle had sanctified its shores by his prayers and his penances? A church which bore his name was erected there to perpetuate the tradition. And though no traces of it remain in our time,

the traditions which it perpetuated are not forgotten. And though some may, with Lanigan, critically question or disregard those traditions, because they may not rest on evidence historically certain, yet we think they may well be treated with respect when found associated with religious observances which have won the admiration of many men of all classes and ranks for centuries. And are there not there still the remains of the old stone cells which speak to us, probably from centuries past, of some of the most celebrated of Ireland's early saints? Yes, many think that the ruins of some of the circular stone-roofed cells, in which our early saints were wont to pray and to perform their heroic penances, may still be seen there. And there, too, we are told, was the "Cave," or "Purgatory," celebrated in the Middle Ages throughout Europe, where unwonted visions of the other world were, it was said, granted to favoured souls—where the veil was sometimes set aside, and the agonies of the reprobate and the joys of the elect were thus partially revealed to mortals. That the fame of the Lough Derg "Cave" was widespread in the Middle Ages, is historically certain. It is also certain that its fame attracted pilgrims from very remote lands. It is well known that its historical and legendary interest suggested to Calderon one of the grandest subjects immortalized by his Muse. It is also certain that its fame was spread through Italy at an early period. But whether Saltrey's narrative of the Knight Owen's experiences of the unseen world at Lough Derg, did or did not suggest to Dante the outline of his noble epic, it is not improbable that it inspired the narrative of the Spanish Viscount, which is reproduced at some length by Philip O'Sullivan in his well-known *Historia Catholica*. This Spaniard, who represents himself as a pilgrim at Lough Derg, sketches with a graphic pen the various regions of hell, with the awful suffering endured by the reprobate within them. He also classifies them, and represents himself as having succeeded in passing through them unharmed, by frequently and piously invoking the divine and the sacred Name. How like the Saltrey narrative! He was next conducted safely through Purgatory; and, finally, favoured with a vision of the bliss of the elect.

Such legendary narratives, however fanciful or ideal, must lend to the place a poetic interest quite distinct from that which is historical and strictly religious.

We find that the penitential practices at Lough Derg were either tolerated or recognised from a very early period. Over two centuries ago it was described by Dr. Lombard as "*celeberimus ille et sanctissimus locus*."¹ Dr. Kirwan—the saintly bishop of Killala—was, about the same period, one of the pilgrims to its shores; and, while punctually performing the duties of the pilgrimage with the humblest, we are assured by his biographer that he also "*diligently applied himself to hearing confessions and preaching sermons*." There the legate Rinucini regrets that he was unable to protect the Purgatory from the ravages of the Calvinists. And, later still, the critical and accomplished De Burgo speaks of it in the very highest terms of praise. He even states that, in his opinion, it was the most remarkable place of pilgrimage in the Church. And the Irish people, yielding to the promptings of their religious feelings, have long regarded the Purgatory as the holiest spot within the Island of Saints. And so, when setting foot upon its soil, they literally "*put their shoes from off their feet*." It is with head reverently uncovered and with naked feet that they visit its holy places; and, as if inspired by the genius of the spot, the pilgrims imitate there the heroic penances of the saints of old, by adopting the rigorous fast peculiar to our country in ages long past, together with other penitential observances usual in our early Church. This must appear all the more remarkable, when we remember that, in consideration of her children's weakness, and of the degenerate spirit of our time, the Church has been obliged to remove most of the restrictions which had made the ecclesiastical fast irksome to nature in the past. But though they have died out elsewhere, the penitential practices of our early Church still find a safe asylum within the island sanctuary of Lough Derg. As in the time of Dr. Lombard, so in our day, the pilgrims support weary nature by one meal only each day. This daily meal

¹ *De Regno Heb. Comment.*, page 119.

consists of bread and water. Those who prefer black tea to water are allowed to use it. Now, as then, the prescribed "rounds" of the Church and cells, &c., are made in bare feet, while the prescribed prayers are recited three times each day. And as the cave is there no longer in which the vigil was spent in prayer and fasting, St. Patrick's Church is used for the purpose. It may, therefore, be said that the penitential exercises there in our days, just as in the time of Dr. De Burgo, seem to have no counterpart in any other European country.

On the evening of our arrival the mists were being drifted in heavy masses along the hills before a sharp east breeze. And as the twilight shadows deepened over the lake, and the outline of hills and islands was being gradually lost in the gloaming, it was strange to watch the pilgrims moving like shadows around the church and cells, and to the water's edge—now kneeling, and again standing in prayer, and finally returning to St. Patrick's little church, where all the penitential and devotional exercises have their opening and their close. It was impressive to catch the murmur of their prayers over the sighing of the night wind and the soft lapping of the water on the broken shore. Yet such are the customary sounds which reach the visitor's ear on Station Island, except when the music of the solemn benediction service, or the pathetic stanzas of the *Stabat Mater* float upon the air from the adjoining church. The casual visitor, who sees for the first time those pilgrims engaged in their penitential exercises, almost unconsciously asks himself if the saints of old have returned to earth again. But no. They are only their spiritual children, who in the nineteenth century imitate the heroic virtues of their ancestors, as they inherit their undying faith. At such a time no very active imagination is required to realize the guardian spirits of the place ascending before the throne with the petitions of the pilgrims, and descending with the graces which bring peace to weary souls who seek it there through Mary and Patrick's intercession. In our time there are many who would contemptuously relegate such practices to the old and the ignorant. But at the Lough Derg pilgrimage on

the occasion of our visit the young were far more numerous than the old, and there were many of both sexes who, judging from their bearing and manner, were persons of education and refinement. Some had come from Scotland and England, and some there were who had crossed from the remote shores of America to the old land, and gratified, by visiting Lough Derg, a long-cherished wish of seeking their great apostle's patronage at his own far-famed shrine.

There are comparatively few, if any, who visit Lough Derg for the mere purpose of gratifying an idle or an irreverent curiosity. Indeed, curiosity is apt to die under the severity of the regime to which visitors know that they are expected to submit there. And the devoted priests in charge of the sanctuary, while courteous to all, are careful to have it felt that it is solely a place of prayer and penitential exercises.

The pilgrims are received there only from the beginning of June to the feast of the Assumption; and the penitential exercises are carried out under the supervision of the priests who reside on the island during that period. In this way the pilgrims succeed in combining the ordinary religious exercises of a retreat with the rigorous fast, and the performance of the penitential exercises in connection with the "Station."

As regards the ritual which prescribes these penitential exercises, it is known only on the island, and seems to have been preserved by an unwritten tradition from a very remote past. It is now substantially unchanged from what it had been in the days of Dr. Lombard—over two hundred years ago. In some of the penitential exercises, however, certain modifications have been introduced, which may be noticed here.

Though continuing for nine days in the past, the exercises may now be completed in three days. Yet, even now, the exercises may be continued for nine days, should the pilgrim wish it.

In the past the vigil was observed only at the conclusion of the exercises, and *in the cave*; now it is observed on the

first night of the pilgrimage, but only in the church. These seem to be the chief relaxations from the rigid procedure usual in Dr. Lombard's time. As regards the use of black tea, now permitted, it can hardly be regarded in the light of a relaxation, as many prefer taking the water of the lake, which is usually taken hot, with a little sugar. By a polite and pardonable euphemism, this beverage is usually referred to as *the wine of the island*, and is regarded by many as agreeable and constitutional.

A knowledge of the devotional exercises of the "Station" must prove interesting to the general public; and may therefore be briefly given here from the copy published in Father O'Connor's interesting *History of Lough Derg*.¹ The pilgrim begins his station by a short visit to the Blessed Sacrament in St. Patrick's Church. He then proceeds to St. Patrick's cross, which stands outside the gable of the southern transept, and recites there a pater, ave, and creed, on bended knees. He next proceeds to the opposite gable, to what may be the site of "St. Bridget's cross" (as it retains that name), and recites the same prayers in the same manner; after which he renews his baptismal vows, in an audible voice, and with arms extended in the form of a cross. After this he walks seven times around the exterior of the church, reciting at each round a decade of the beads, and adding a creed at the last.

The "beds" or "cells" of the chief patrons of the island are next visited successively by the pilgrims, in the following manner:—three circuits of the outside of the cell are first made, while three paters, three aves, and a creed are recited; the pilgrims then kneel at the entrance of the cell, and recite there the same prayers; and, having entered, the same prayers are again recited, while they make three circuits of the interior. A large crucifix occupies the centre of each cell, before which the pilgrims again kneel, and after reciting the same prayers kiss them reverently. Having visited the various cells, the pilgrim next proceeds to the water's edge on the south-eastern shore, and there recites, in a standing posture, five paters, five aves, and a creed; after which he

kneels, and repeats the same prayers on bended knees. From the water's edge the pilgrim returns to St. Patrick's cross, and, kneeling, repeats there the same prayers which he recited at the beginning of the station. He finally returns to St. Patrick's Church, where the usual prayers for the Pope's intention are recited by many, even after each station, though not prescribed; many also add a third of the Rosary. Father O'Connor summarizes these devotional exercises in the following sentence:—

"Our readers will be able to form some idea of the piety and devotion practised at this holy retreat, when we tell them that a Station at present consists, besides the visit to the Blessed Sacrament, of ninety-seven paters, one hundred and sixty aves, and twenty-nine creeds; that three of these Stations are performed each day; and that at the end of each day's Station five decades of the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin are said."¹

In estimating the severity of these exercises of the "Stations," it should not be forgotten that they are gone through in bare feet; and that the surface of the island, which is naturally rugged, is strewn alike with the wreck of its old monastic buildings, and with *débris* from the buildings recently erected there. The paths of the barefooted pilgrims are over such a surface. Yes, they are now, as they were when visited by Dr. Kirwan, over two hundred years ago, "paths beaten by the feet of saints." They may be truly described as pathways of penance.

As the soft light of the early summer morning begins to glow upon the surrounding hills and to play on the surface of the sparkling lake, the bell summons the pilgrims to morning prayer, and to an early mass at five o'clock. There is a midday visit to the Blessed Sacrament, and a lecture; and when the evening falls the bell summons the pilgrims once more to the church for evening prayer, benediction, and sermon, after which the Stations of the Cross are gone through. It will thus be seen that the spare time may well be filled up by the preparation for confession. It is on the third day that the pilgrims usually approach the altar.

It is interesting and encouraging to know that by an indult dated 26th June, 1870, a plenary indulgence has been

¹ *Ibid.*, page 188.

attached by the late supreme pontiff to the Lough Derg pilgrimage. This favour has been granted without limitation as to time, and at the "postulation" of the present venerated bishop of the diocese of Clogher, who guards the old sanctuary with so much watchful care. It appears from the terms of his lordship's "postulation" that it enjoyed a similar privilege in the early part of this century. It also appears from an official communication addressed by Dr. M'Mahon, one of his lordship's venerated predecessors, to the Holy See in the beginning of the last century, that a similar favour had been extended to it by Pope Clement X. Such encouragement from the supreme pontiffs may have, in part, explained how the pilgrimage continued in his time "with little or no interruption," despite the severe penal enactments of the period for its suppression. And the prelate adds:—"Though everywhere else throughout the kingdom, the ecclesiastical functions have ceased on account of the prevailing persecution, in this island, as if it were placed in another orb, the exercise of religion is free *and public*, which is ascribed to a special favour of divine Providence and to the merits of St. Patrick.' It is also recorded by this good prelate, that on the occasion of his visit there, a Protestant was converted at the sight of the earnestness and piety of the pilgrims.

We know that some of the penitential exercises, such as the circuits of the cells, and the prayers at the water's edge, may be regarded as unmeaning by persons who know nothing of the penitential practices of our early monks. But a knowledge of those ancient practices enables us to see in them but the survival of customs that were dear to our early saints. The circular stone-roofed cells, the ruins of which may still be seen in many parts of Ireland, were occupied by those holy men. As their lives were lives of continuous prayer, many of their daily prayers must have been recited while moving around their cells. Choice and perhaps atmospheric changes, frequently determined whether those circuits might be in the open air or within the cell. In the pilgrim's "rounds" both within and without the cells, we have little else than a devoted imitation of the old practice,

The prayers recited at the water's edge must remind us of a practice of extreme severity with which our early monks were familiar, and which was consecrated by the example of our national apostle; that, namely, of praying while standing immersed in cold water.¹ And this practice was long continued in the early ages of our Church. It does not seem to have entirely died out, at least at Lough Derg, when Dr. Kirwan visited its sanctuaries in the seventeenth century. His biographer tells us that the pilgrims at that time were in the habit of "advancing a considerable distance into the water" to pray.² The testimony of Dr. Lombard is similar.

In Dr. Lombard's time the "cave" or "Purgatory" was in being, and used by the pilgrims—though he is careful to point out that in popular estimation it had undergone certain structural changes. It was then almost on the same level as the surrounding surface of the island. It was built and roofed with stone, and lighted only by one small aperture. It was so low that the inmates could scarcely stand erect, and was capable of accommodating only about a dozen penitents together. Yet here they spent twenty-four hours in watching and praying, and without any food whatever.³ Lynch refers to it as "a place of dismal darkness," in which "they partake of nothing save a little water to moisten their throats when parched with thirst."⁴ It was natural that the place and its practices should excite accordingly the special hostility of the heretics. Legal enactments of special severity were passed against them. In the year 1632, Sir William Stewart, by orders of the Government, had the Purgatory "defaced and utterly demolished." Every trace of the cave was removed; and the stone preserved within it, on which St. Patrick was supposed to have knelt in prayer, was cast into the depths of the lake. Yet, though the very "foundations of the place were rooted up" by the fanatical Puritans, the "cave" was again reconstructed; and in defiance of persecution and penal enactments, pilgrims

¹ *Aquis Algidis se. Immergus Com. de Reg. Hib.*, page 75.

² *Comment De Regno Hib.*, page 119.

³ *Vitu Kirwan.*

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, page 61.

sought the shores of the island sanctuary from even the most remote parts of Ireland. It was in persecutions' darkest days that Dr. M'Mahon found religion "free and public" within this sanctuary, while its functions had ceased throughout the kingdom. The numbers who came to seek admission to the reconstructed "cave" became so large towards the middle of the last century, that the prior in charge thought it desirable to erect a church which might be used instead. Accordingly the Church of St. Patrick—known also as the "prison church"—was erected. The "cave" was then finally closed, and the church has since been used as the recognised and authorised substitute. It was then a simple oblong building, but has since assumed a cruciform shape by the addition of commodious transepts. It stands on the north western side of the island.

On the opposite shore stands St. Mary's Church. The church which stands there now, was lately erected by the present energetic prior. It is an oblong with a small chancel. Its simple lancet windows and buttressed wall in ashlar present a neat and effective exterior.

Describing the sleeping accommodation of the island, Dr. Lynch writes:—"When night comes on, they (the pilgrims) lie down, not to enjoy repose, but to snatch a few hours' sleep. Their beds are of straw, unfurnished with coverlids."¹ When Dr. M'Mahon visited in the following century, we learn that the pilgrims slept "upon the cold ground." As regards this feature in the penitential exercises of the island, a radical change has been introduced, but one which we think has been imperatively demanded by the altered standard of delicacy of feeling and constitution peculiar to our age. A commodious hospice has been accordingly erected in the island in which sleeping accommodation is provided for even considerable numbers. While sufficiently commodious, its internal arrangements are wisely in harmony with the character of the place and the object of the pilgrimage. It may be also added that exteriorly the outline of the hospice is pleasing and monastic.

¹ *Vita Kirwan*, page 61.

In the open space, immediately in front of the hospice, life-size statues of our Lady, St. Joseph, and St. Patrick have been erected recently. They are of marble, and those of St. Joseph and St. Patrick, which have been executed in Rome, reflect great credit on the artist. That of St. Patrick merits special attention. He is represented arrayed in episcopal robes, with mitre and crozier, and holding the shamrock raised aloft in his right hand, as he may be supposed to have held it at Tara when illustrating the sacred dogma of the Trinity to the great parliament of the nation. The attitude and expression show a singular combination of authority, dignity, and sweetness. The erection in the island of those beautiful specimens of sacred art is a gratifying evidence that what is beautiful in sacred art in the nineteenth century shall soon bear testimony to what was heroic in the penitential spirit of our ancestors; and that our national sanctuary may soon bear upon it the visible impress of a nation's love and reverence.

J. FAHEY.

"THE OXFORD MOVEMENT: TWELVE YEARS.
1833-1845."¹

WHEN a system of thought, feeling, or action has secured far-reaching consequences, and has completely changed or modified one side of our national life, it is well that the beginning, growth, and final development of such system should be presented to us from a variety of points of view. That the Tractarian movement did effect great changes in the Protestantism of England, and to a lesser extent in that of Ireland, is undeniable. We, therefore, welcome a further history of its origin and work, notwithstanding the fact that the story has already been told so fully and so sincerely, and with so much sympathy and pathos by its inspiring

¹ By R. W. Church, sometime Dean of St. Paul's. London and New York: Macmillan and Co.

leader, by the man who, better than any other, knew its real import, that, at first sight, all other accounts would seem to be superfluous.

The *Apologia* of Cardinal Newman, however, from its very perfection, leaves us, on one point, in a questioning frame of mind. It is, as is well known, a history of the gradual emancipation of a soul; and had the emancipation stopped short in any inadequate way, had the deliverance not been so complete and final as it was, the book had failed to satisfy us. But it is also well known, that to many of Newman's fellow-workers, to many who shared his early labours and his first hopes, deliverance never was vouchsafed. When their great leader saw light, and, thorny and painful as was the road, yet bravely followed its guidance, they hung back and refused to follow. After the first alarm and consternation were passed, these disciples fell each into his own particular line; and for the future, avoiding deep and heart-searching questions, they led apparently contented lives in a communion into which—their efforts to catholicize it having failed—they had merely succeeded in bringing a fresh element of discordant teaching. Disappointing as we may deem such a fall from high hopes to be, it is well that we should make an effort to understand how it came to pass. Men of the high calibre of certain of Newman's friends must have something to say for themselves, and to this we are bound to listen. We do so the more readily when the tale is told with the literary skill, the delicacy of touch, and the tolerant consideration for other views which characterize Dean Church's volume.

That the volume before us gives a satisfactory answer to the question, why so many men who went the one mile with Newman, compelled thereto by piety and personal fascination, should have resolutely refused to go the second mile, we cannot affirm. The question is, probably, insoluble. The spirit bloweth where it listeth; one is taken, and another is left, and it is not for us to assign the reason. It is easy to make assertions, to impute interested or unworthy motives, to suppose abnormal stupidity, or steady resistance to acknowledged grace. But, in the presence of the dignified

and elevating account which Dean Church gives of the men and of the times of which he writes, we feel that such accusations, if made, would but recoil on their author. All that is left for us to do, is to point out how meagre and unsatisfactory is the explanation of an acknowledged fact, and how poor were the actual results of the high hopes with which the Tractarians started, so far as they touched on Anglican Protestantism.

The commencement of the Tractarian movement is generally dated from Mr. Keble's assize sermon, preached at Oxford, in July, 1833. Dean Church prefaces his account of its early days by a description of the state of the Establishment when Tractarianism sounded the first note of alarm, and the need of defensive action. Those were days of general and of philosophical excitement. The Reform agitation had awakened and stirred many minds on other subjects than simple politics, whilst the philosophy of Bentham and the elder Mill was teaching others to probe deep questions deeply, to rest satisfied with no half or inadequate answers, and to realize fully the truth and reason of all to which their assent was asked. The verdict which would be the result of such questioning concerning a rich and indolent body like the Anglican Establishment—a body of which it could be truly said that "it was slumbering and sleeping when the visitation of change came upon it"—is not difficult to prophesy. That it was told "to put its house in order" by Whig statesmen, has been deemed a grave insult, and at the time was seriously resented. The Tractarian movement was, however, an attempt to obey the not unneeded summons, and its promoters may be considered as striving to justify the existence of their Church, in reply to the attacks of the Liberal school, by trying to bring it more into harmony with the lofty pretensions of many of its formularies, to put life and reality into its doctrines and discipline, and to imbue its members with a high standard of holiness.

That this last was the main object of the movement, is strongly insisted on in the present volume. "The movement was, above all, a moral one; it was nothing, allowed to be nothing, if it was not this." It was a call to a serious

and reverend view of religion and duty, and, above all, to a dread of unreal words in their connection, or to professions which, though not consciously insincere, men were not prepared to fulfil to the utmost in their lives. Newman's sermons at St. Mary's and Littlemore, which, even more than the Tracts, influenced the spread of the movement and brought it adherents, were seldom doctrinal in their main import. Rather they treated, as a rule, of that holiness which "is necessary for future blessedness," which was the title of his first published sermon. "It was this wholeheartedness, this supreme reverence for moral goodness, more than even the great ability of the leaders, and in spite of mistakes and failures, which gave its cohesion and its momentum to the movement in its early stages." It was the work of men of deeply serious minds, of men to whom God and the unseen were the only matters of real and lasting interest, and to whom religion meant the most awful and the closest personal concern on earth. In a world where the type of clergyman depicted in Miss Austin's novels—and her's is no unfriendly hand—still existed, or where much that was admirable in the more worthy and religious evangelicals was yet overlaid by pretentious words and inconsistent grotesqueness, it was not wonderful that the effort to bring about a reaction "against the slackness of fibre in the religious world; against the poverty, softness, restlessness, worldliness, the blunted and impaired sense of truth, which reigned with little check in the recognised fashions of professing Christianity," was felt to be bracing, and worth striving after as a high and ennobling aim.

On looking backward, we can now see that what has lasted and grown and prospered in the Church of England as the result of the Tractarian movement is precisely that side of it of which we have spoken. It is the side with which we and all Christians can sympathize—that increase and vitality in their religious life and in the doing of good, and the readiness to make sacrifices at the call of duty, which were, and are still to-day, to be found in the ranks of Anglican High Churchmen. On its doctrinal side the movement was weak and easily answered by a theologian. As all men know, the

great theological mind to whose adhesion is mainly due the early successes of the movement, was driven, after more than one change of his doctrinal standpoint, by the mere exigencies of truth, to cut himself adrift from early home and friends, and to oppose the very system he had been the main instrument in creating. Had Newman been more one-sided, had his intellect been subordinated to his moral sense, the issue might have been different. Had he been content to take unquestioned all the articles of the Creed, or even to stop short at the momentous one, "I believe in the Catholic Church" he might have shared the fate of Keble and Pusey, indeed of Church himself, and died in his blindness. But the very questions which the Dean tells us were the main propositions of Tractarianism on its theological side—What is the Church? On what grounds does it rest? How may it be known? Is it amongst us?—these very questions, when put to a fearless and keen intellect, to a truth-loving conscience, to a man ready to brave all for the sake of God and right, could bring forth but one answer.

We find ourselves, however, already discussing the conclusion of this volume, before we have made any endeavour to place its earlier contents before our readers; an omission on which, before we attempt to rectify it, we will make one remark. The fact is, that the history of the movement is mainly interesting as the history of Newman himself. The story flags when he is overshadowed, and grows vivid, life-like, and attractive the moment he again springs into prominence. The end comes with the end of his own career in the Church of England—"the catastrophe," as, from his point of view, Dean Church not untruly calls Newman's reception into the "one fold of Christ." Attractive as are the portraits of many of the fellow-workers in the movement of which we read in this volume, and praiseworthy and disinterested as was their work, both they and it fail in having that indescribable but easily felt power over us which we call *interesting*, and which Cardinal Newman possessed in a supreme degree. The manner in which Dean Church recurs again and again to Newman and to his influence is evidence of the above

remark; and although Dr. Pusey is nominally considered the leader of the party bearing his name, the very small portion of this history of the movement which is devoted to him reduces his position to its true proportions; whereas the many pages in which we read of Newman, show where was the main power and real influence. We should not, however, give a fair account of Dean Church's history were we not to endeavour to place his descriptions of other men before our readers.

We are told that, in the beginning, the movement was the work of three men. Keble gave the inspiration; Hurrell Froude gave the propelling impulse; whilst Newman took possession of the work, and for the future the direction was his. With these other and less familiar names were associated, men little known to Catholics, but who may now live with an importance not their own, as having given Church subjects for very perfect and delicately-drawn portraits in words, and be saved from oblivion by the excellence of his sketches—Isaac Williams the poet, Charles Marriott, Cope-land (who gave his name as editor of Newman's Anglican sermons when republished), Hugh Rose, and others. They were men who, as a rule, had had distinguished university careers, and whose lives were greatly influenced by one or other of the Tractarian leaders. Thus, Isaac Williams came up to Oxford—where he soon gained a scholarship at Trinity College—as a careless but ambitious youth, "who had never heard a word about Christianity, and to whom religion, its aims and its restraints, were a mere name." He brought with him an introduction to Keble, then a great Oxford don, but as an undergraduate saw little of him, until Keble's attention was attracted by Williams writing the prize poem of the year. Shortly after, Keble offered to take him as a companion and pupil during the vacation, and the influence to which he was subjected during these months determined the future direction of Williams' character and life. As he says: "It was this very trivial accident . . . which was the turning-point of my life." During this vacation Williams came not only to appreciate the essential characteristics of Christianity, but he also received a considerable

amount of theological teaching. At that date, such teaching was rather that of the old-fashioned, High Church orthodoxy than of the neo-"Catholicism" of the Tractarians. Indeed, to the end, Isaac Williams represented the more moderate side of the movement—the side which was averse from all change, and which relied more on infusing greater reality into religious teaching, and more self-discipline into the lives of the teachers, than on new views, or even on the reassertion of old truths, for awakening and deepening the Christianity of England.

A chapter in this volume is also devoted to Charles Marriott; and in it we have a life-like portrait of a little-appreciated, though very useful type of man. Marriott had gained high academical distinction, and could well have obtained an independent position, yet he was content humbly to live his life in the spirit of a disciple, and never wished to shine except with the reflected light of his master. When brought under Newman's influence, he placed his whole life and talents at the services of the former, in his endeavours to reanimate and elevate the Establishment. Marriott was willing to take the modest, though necessary part of a translator, a collator, an editor of other men's writings. He believed that the leaders were wiser than himself, and was satisfied with doing the work they assigned him, this being "to raise the standard of knowledge of early Christian literature, and to make that knowledge accurate and scholar-like." To his life's end, we are told, he continued "a disciple." Unfortunately, however, instead of allowing his master to lead him onwards, when the final change came, and a real sacrifice was demanded, he drew back; and, instead of venturing all for a great gain, he simply transferred his allegiance to Newman's successor (we suppose Pusey is meant), and served him, too, with equal diligence. With these men were associated Percival, William Palmer (not the future Catholic), and Hugh Rose.

The alarm at this moment amongst Churchmen was very genuine. The Establishment was assailed by foes from without, and its defence so far had been undertaken, at best, after a half-hearted fashion by its members. Indeed, amongst

these were many whom it was difficult to distinguish from open enemies, so ready did they seem to yield all that the latter might ask; and, still worse, the Tractarians could discern no principle in the public mind to which they could appeal, no consistent theory of Church government or doctrinal basis on which they could rely. The country was inundated with pamphlets on Church reform and Church enlargement, meaning generally little besides Church despoiling and Church dismemberment; whilst the abolition of the creeds and all that distinguished the Establishment from the sects around her, was openly advocated. The necessity of speedy action was obvious; the danger was imminent; indeed, if it could be averted for a while, the Tractarians were hopeful that they could stem the anti-religious current which threatened to engulf so much they revered and valued. "I should have little fear, if I thought we could stand for ten or fifteen years as we are," wrote Mr. Rose.

The means taken by the friends of the existing order to baffle its assailant, seem, at first sight, somewhat inadequate. The idea of founding an association to defend their cause was suggested; but, being found unworkable, was abandoned, and an address to the Archbishop of Canterbury was the only action determined on. It had greater success and influence than could have been expected, and bore the signatures of seven thousand clergymen; and, moreover, was followed by a lay address, signed by two hundred and thirty thousand heads of families. Besides the large number of those who actually signed, the fact that a canvass for names was being carried on must have brought to many more thousands the knowledge that a stir was in the air; and, as a fact, the Tractarians dated the turn of the tide in their favour to the presentation of these two addresses. Had nothing more followed, it is not probable that such an assertion would have been possible; but, behind the addresses and in full sympathy with their object, were the three men of whom we spoke above, Keble, and Hurrell Froude, and, above all, Newman. Although, however, agreeing that the addresses were useful, so far as they went, the three friends considered that something more direct, more awaken-

ing, even more startling, was called for by the evils of the day, and the issue of the *Tracts for the Times* was determined on, and thus the struggle began in earnest.

Out of his own head Newman began the Tracts, and in their brief, clear, but stern intensity they were something very different from anything of the kind yet heard in England. He wrote in the buoyant frame of mind which resulted from the renewed health and strength that followed his serious illness in Sicily, in the "exultation of health restored and home regained." Dean Church gives in full the first Tract. It was addressed to "The Presbyters and Deacons of the Church of Christ in England;" and if we put ourselves in the place of the average, comfortably established parson, with his snug rectory and garden and happy family relations, we cannot wonder that the appeal to be drawn from their pleasant retreats into the arena of strife and battle for great principles (principles, too, which they hardly understood) found little response; or, that the still bolder wish that the bishops might have a blessed termination to their course in the spoiling of their goods and eventual martyrdom, was as deeply resented as the Whig threat of Disestablishment.

But, though this was the case in the country, from the first, at Oxford, the Tracts were a powerful force which soon greatly influenced the whole University. They now followed each other in rapid succession, and by the end of the next year had reached the number of forty-six, and were republished as a volume. Whilst these were enforcing some elementary Catholic truths, a still more potent influence in the same direction was brought to bear on Oxford at St. Mary's Church. Here Newman was preaching his famous parochial and university sermons every Sunday afternoon; and in these discourses the full meaning of the doctrines, and their bearing on our lives and daily conduct, was enlarged on and developed. "While men were reading and talking about the Tracts, they were hearing the sermons: and in the sermons they heard the living meaning and reason and bearing of the Tracts, their ethical affinities, their moral standard." Thus, at the same time, men were intellectually

brought to acknowledge truths, whilst their will and their heart were engaged in the task of making their life accord with them. The result could not but be the elevation of the whole tone of the University.

In the early days of its success, the party were fortunate in securing Dr. Pusey as a coadjutor. Though sympathetic, he had at first abstained from identifying himself with the movement; but in its second year he definitely joined it. He was a man of influence on account of his “religious seriousness, his deep learning, his position of professor at Oxford, and his friendly relations with the University authorities.” His adhesion changed the character of the Tracts. In the place of short, startling, often one-sided, and in many ways incomplete papers, they became regular theological treatises, and for the future were either carefully elaborated essays on questions then being discussed, or else *catenae* of patristic or of Anglican divinity, intended to support the theories advocated by the Tractarians. Dr. Pusey’s co-operation was, moreover, a voucher that, however novel might be their teaching, nothing adverse to the Church of England was intended; that the leaders knew what they were about; and that only benefit to the Establishment would result from their efforts.

So far, many things had favoured the spread of the movement, and in many ways its promoters might count themselves happy. The time, the locality, and above all, the great leader tended to arrest attention. As we before said, these were days of wide-spread intellectual activity. The emancipation and political triumph of the Catholic Church had re-awakened the animosity of her enemies; and whilst the Tractarians were preaching doctrines hardly distinguishable from her own, the Evangelicals, on their side, started a “Reformation Society,” which commenced an “anti-popery” agitation all over the country. Although this opposition, which soon became directed as hotly against the Tractarians as against the Church, may, at first sight, appear to have been dangerous, its result in the end was the very reverse from damaging; for, not only did it arouse men’s interest, and set them inquiring and questioning

concerning the matter in debate, but the very violence and unscrupulousness of the attacks often rebounded on their authors, and their exaggeration produced the very opposite effect to that wished for or intended. Oxford, too, was a worthy stage for the acting of the theological drama, which was played out between 1833 and 1845. The University has always had a self-centred life of its own; and if in these days of rapid communication, and the annihilation of distance, it is now less noticeable, in the first half of the century, before even a railway came within many miles of Oxford, its isolation as a school of thought was still complete. Oxford had its own fashions and ways, its own social ranks and positions, its laws and discipline, and its special characteristics. Although its proud claim to be pre-eminently the guardian of "true religion and sound learning" occasioned in its midst a certain jealousy of innovation, yet a place where all the actors knew one another, and were meeting daily, a place where the atmosphere was full of controversy and intelligent and critical humour, was no inappropriate locale for a "Church Revival." On such a scene appeared Newman, with his fascinating personality, his unsought influence, and, above all, his heart-searching sermons—those deeply sympathetic addresses, wherein each and every soul could find an answer to its questions and a power against its temptations.

As we stated before, had the movement been only ethical, the issue might have been widely different. But, besides inculcating sincerity of feeling, simplicity of life, and an elevated standard of character, Newman had early realized that true holiness cannot exist unless it be based on a firm and consistent faith. Although questions of doctrine were not prominently forced to the front, the acceptance of an orthodox standard of Anglican belief was presupposed; and an effort was made to put reality into the words which, by constant unheeded repetition had come to mean little to many who used them. The Tracts had been started with the idea of setting forth the strong but forgotten claims of the Church, and not unnaturally the question, What is the Church? speedily followed the attempt to create an interest

in her welfare. To many, she represented a mere abstraction; to others, she was only the nation on its religious side; or again, she was simply the aggregate of all good Christians of every creed or sect throughout the world. The Tractarians had, however, mastered the truth so far as to believe that the Church was the kingdom of Christ, founded by Him, and resting on a visible organization, with a power of teaching the truth, and of imparting heavenly ordinances. With so true a belief before them, and face to face with the difficulty of harmonizing it with the established body of which they formed a part, it was certain that what was styled the “Roman question,” would soon become of irrepressible importance.

As we said of the *Apologia*, so we may say of the movement, that it is mainly the history of the emancipation of Newman's soul; and this being so, it is worth while to follow in detail the steps by which he extricated himself from his early errors. He had started with the popular belief that the Pope was Anti-Christ, and that the case was so clear against the whole Roman system, as to need no further examination—it carried its own condemnation on its very front. As we read lately in his *Letters*, he wrote: “As to the Roman system, I have ever detested it so much, that I cannot detest it more by seeing it”—an opinion, indeed, which is more consistent with itself, and more easy to understand, than the more temperate views by which it was succeeded. If the Church is *not* all she claims to be, we fully admit that she is an impostor; and as such, of her very nature she is anti-Christian. With the majesty and power of the Church, Newman appears always to have been impressed; but, at first, they had seemed to him to represent the greatness of a Babylon, the magnificence of a fallen spirit—great merely for evil, which, whilst it might fascinate, must yet be opposed by all on God's side. The study even of Anglican divinity served somewhat to modify these views; and although still holding that the “Romanism” of the modern Church was seriously corrupt, yet he gradually came to admit that the body in communion with Rome had not altogether forfeited the claim to form part of the Church of

Christ. The arguments against Rome, he speedily discovered, required sifting. Many must be discarded as proving too much, and as fatal to belief in any Church at all. Others were founded on misrepresentation arising out of popular ignorance, and if seriously relied on, would simply recoil on their own party.

Together with Newman's knowledge of the extravagance and falsity of much in the Protestant conception of the Church, came a change in his animus. Rome to him was no longer Anti-Christ, but a strange and wonderful mixture of good and bad, attractive from her greatness, for the extent of her sway, her world-wide organization, and her imperial authority, and because she surpassed every other form of religion, for good as well as for evil. The evils, however, were so evident, and Rome's claim to supremacy and infallibility were so inadmissible, that either submission to her, or union with her were impossible. The duty of Anglicans, he held, was to resist Rome ; but, in doing so, it was not necessary, nor was it truthful, to have recourse to indiscriminate and coarse abuse, or to deny the good which was to be found mingled with the supposed evil. The idea of a pure Church on the one hand, and of a hopelessly corrupt body on the other, was exchanged for that of two portions of the Church of Christ, each with its own history and life and character, existing side by side, neither being perfect, and neither realizing, in fact, all that they professed in theory ; yet neither having so sinned as to have forfeited the promises of Christ. We are told that Newman dared to know and acknowledge much of real Christian life in the Church of Rome that our insular self-satisfaction did not care or wish to know, and to own that much that was considered "Popery" was really "Catholic;" though whilst he did this, he fiercely attacked, and, as he supposed, with a hand strengthened by the fact of its moderation elsewhere, the main notes of the Church's apostolicity and infallibility. But, as is freely admitted, it is easier for an Anglican to upset in argument the authority of the Church than to indicate by what authority it is to be replaced. The *Via Media*, as Newman's theory was called, though it may be

supposed fatal to the claims of the Catholic Church, denies the existence of any teaching Church whatsoever. If Rome may not teach infallibly, in spite of her historic claim to do so, England, without making any such claim, undoubtedly cannot do so either; and the teaching office of the Church is denied or considered to be in abeyance. Dean Church, indeed, goes further, and ventures to assert that in the “early and undivided Church,” though there was such a thing as authority, there was no such thing as infallibility. Were we to allow this, and to agree that no claim to teach absolute truth was ever made in the first centuries, we must admit with the sceptic that we receive even the creeds of the Church on inadequate grounds.

To the *Via Media* two objections were made, and were never satisfactorily answered. The first was, that, although the authority of the early Church was appealed to, her definitions could only apply to early controversies; and that, as a fact, the decisions of the first centuries had left untouched a great portion of the deposit of the faith. Secondly—and this objection appears to Dean Church the more serious of the two:—

“Your theory is nothing but a paper theory; it never was a reality; it never can be. There may be an ideal ‘halting-place, there is neither a logical nor an actual one, between Romanism and the ordinary negations of Protestantism.’ The answer to the challenge then was, ‘Let us see if it cannot be realized. It has recognised foundations to build upon, and the impediments and interruptions which have hindered it are well known. Let us see if it will not turn out something more than a paper theory.’”

This answer was given in 1835, but was abandoned in 1845, needlessly, thinks Dean Church, as, in his opinion, whatever may be the failings of the Church of England, she has at least shown in the last fifty years, that she is no “paper” Church. We have no wish to assert that she has; but, whilst we admit as much, we yet assert that the *Via Media* is a “paper” theory; and that by its abandonment, and not by its maintenance, the Church of England has worked successfully, so far as she can claim success. We

should be anticipating were we to enlarge on this topic here ; but the very canons by which Dean Church bids us judge of the Establishment to-day, merely by its work and zeal in doing good, are beside the mark, so far as the theory is concerned.

The first years of the movement were those of its chief success. Newman still possessed unbounded confidence in his position ; no doubt had yet assailed him, nor had it crossed his mind that, although he might hold his own against popular Protestantism, in the closer fight with Rome he would be driven to yield. Troubles from his Protestant enemies were, however, near at hand ; and whilst these were gathering into a storm of University and Episcopal condemnation, the little rift in the party itself unexpectedly opened—the rift that was to widen into an impassable gulf—and whilst it shattered the fortunes of the movement, shook the very foundations of the Establishment.

In 1839, whilst deep in patristic studies, the thought, like the apparition of a ghost, suddenly flashes through Newman : "The Church of Rome will be found right after all," and henceforth to him "the world is never the same again." A new struggle began, and from this moment the Tractarian party was divided in two, and the body of men who had so far acted in perfect unison, began to show a double aspect, whilst their great leader wrestled with conflicting calls and duties—between the simple and undivided truth, and home and country, early associations and present hopes, the ties of kindred and the affection of friends. The division in the party soon became manifest in its works and writings. Whilst most of the earlier members still confined their labour to improving the existing Church of England, Newman and the more recent recruits were searching their hearts as to whether the body in question was a part of Christ's Church at all ; whether, in working for her, they might not be working against the Catholic Church. The conflict lasted for years, and it was long before Newman could definitely settle the antagonistic claims by which he was confronted. The ideal of the early Church was always before him, specially in its double aspect of Apostolicity and

Catholicity ; and whilst, on the one hand, the non-Catholicity of the Anglican body was obvious to all ; on the other, his study of the early Fathers had led him to suppose that the Roman Church was non-apostolic, in so much as her teaching went beyond that of the first centuries, and defined much then left untouched. Until he could explain the apparent difference between the teaching of the first ages of Christianity and the present faith of the Catholic Church, he could not bring himself to throw in his lot with her's. The link was at length found in the theory of the gradual development of Christian doctrine, a theory which anticipated in the realms of theology Darwin's explanation of phenomena in the world of natural history and science—a theory by which we discover the gradual growth of the Catholic faith from the mustard-seed of its first deposit, and by which the essential unity of the Church's teaching through centuries of definitions is made manifest, and the doctrines of to-day with those of the Apostles are proved to be one, in the same sense as the full ear of corn is one with the grain from which it springs. Newman's mind being satisfied on this point, the apostolicity of the Church being proved :—

"Then the force of the great vision of the Catholic Church came upon him unchecked and irresistible. That was a thing present, visible, undeniable as a fact of nature ; that was a thing at once old and new ; it belonged as truly, as manifestly, to the recent and modern world of democracy and science as it did to the Middle Ages and the Fathers, to the world of Gregory and Innocent, to the world of Athanasius and Augustine. The majesty, the vastness of an imperial polity, outlasting all states and kingdoms, all social changes and political revolutions, answered at once to the promises of the prophecies, and to the antecedent idea of the universal Kingdom of God. Before this great idea, embodied in concrete form, and not a paper doctrine, partial scandals and abuses seemed to sink into insignificance. Objections seemed petty and ignoble ; the pretence of rival systems, impertinent and absurd. He resented almost with impatience anything in the way of theory or explanation which seemed to him narrow, technical, dialectical. He would look at nothing but what had on it the mark of greatness and largeness which befitted the awful subject, and was worthy of arresting the eye and attention of an ecclesiastical statesman, alive to mighty interests, compared to which even the most serious human affairs were dwarfed and obscured."

That one who could thus write—as Dean Church writes—of the effect of God's Church on another, should have himself remained insensible to her influence, is a saddening reflection. Beside this picture of a great organization, of a world-reaching religion, of the only Christian body worthy of being the earthly representation of the power of God, all trivial objections do, indeed, seem petty and ignoble; and that he who could thus designate them should yet have been their slave, seems inexplicable.

To return, however, to Oxford. At the time that Newman's doubts were becoming urgent, the movement was joined by men differing in many ways from its first promoters—men without strong affection for the Church of England, who were impatient of her logical inconsistencies, who required distinct answers to distinct questions, and positive proof for much that the earlier school had taken for granted; above all, men to whom the great Church of Rome was ever present as an ideal, from which, although they were shut off, they were yet anxious to conform to. These were anxious not so much to improve the Establishment on the old lines, as to approximate it so far as possible to the perfect Catholicity of Rome, their "Ideal of a Christian Church." Amongst the most prominent of the neo-Tractarians we may name Ward, Dalgairns, Faber, and Oakeley, who all followed Newman in his all-important change, and to whom, later on, the Church was indebted for good and serviceable work.

Into the outside opposition which forced the hand of the advanced section of the Tractarian party, we do not now propose to enter. The attitude of the bishops, the condemnation by the Oxford authorities, even the University degradation of Mr. Ward, are an oft-told tale, and have been lately fully discussed in notices both of Dr. Ward's *Life*, and Cardinal Newman's *Letters*. The end of the Tractarian hopes, however, was the result more of the action of the leader of the party than the effect of any outward opposition. The enmity of Protestantism would only have braced the party; the defection of its chief annihilated it. Its foes proved, indeed, to be those of its own household, and the story of the great "catastrophy" which shattered the party and de-

stroyed the hope of converting the Establishment into an integral part of the Church of Christ, is told, not without a certain pathos, by Dean Church, though he fails to admit its full destructive force. To the remnant that refused to follow Newman, his secession and those which accompanied it, were merely a cloud; a very black cloud, it is true, yet only to be looked on as a mere temporary hindrance to the restoration to our country of the Catholic faith. To us, however, these events seem of greater importance; and, considering the high hopes of 1833 and their result, not only in 1845, but to-day, we cannot but think that with the final relinquishment of Newman's hopes for the Establishment, the Tractarian movement ceased to exist. The keenest intellect, the loftiest mind, and the finest character engaged in the experiment, was obliged sorrowfully to own that he had failed in engrafting the Catholic Church on to the Established Religion; and to admit that the English Church, on nearer sight, was discovered to be, not an indolent, an unworthy, or even a corrupt part of the Catholic Church; but that, notwithstanding many excellencies as a religious body, it was yet altogether outside the one Church of Christ.

And with this view—viz., the extinction of Tractarianism as a serious school of thought—we fail to see that Dean Church's last statement in any way clashes. He tells us that, when recovering from the first consternation and alarm of 1845, the party sought again for a principle by which they might measure their rule of life, the *Via Media* was not revived, nor was the stale assertion made that in all things England was as simply right as Rome was wrong. Nor at this date was the hollow theory of a Church with geographical limits yet advanced, a Church which, whilst it was Catholic in England, was schismatic abroad, with the correlative assertion that the Catholic Church in England is a mere intruder, and is to be shunned as such. No, the appeal was made from “brilliant logic, and keen sarcasm, and pathetic and impressive eloquence, to reality and experience, as well as to history as to the positive and substantial characteristics of the traditional and actually existing English Church, shown not on paper but in work, and in spite of contradictory appearances and inconsistent elements.”

Shorn of all rhetoric, this would amount to saying that the appeal was made simply to the *work*, past and present, of the Church of England; that work which, whilst we have no wish to decry its excellence or to lessen its importance, we have no hesitation in affirming, is to be found as active and as successful in every other religious body in England as in the Establishment. To depend on the excellence of the work done by the so-called "Catholic" school for its justification, is to undermine the very foundations of the definite creed by which the Tractarians sought to stem the latitudinarianism of their day. Newman's action had evidenced that either the principles of the movement must be abandoned, or their legitimate issue would be found in submission to the Catholic Church. To appeal from his dictum to the good work done by the party since 1845 is surely beside the mark, differs little from liberalism in religion, and simply plays into the hands of those who maintain indifference to all dogma so long as a good and holy life is led. The assertion that the successes which have followed the labours of the High Church school in late years should be considered as vindicating the movement, and being beyond those for which the most sanguine Tractarian hoped, we think is evidence that at the date when Dean Church wrote he must have entirely forgotten what those hopes were. That, in externals, Catholic worship is emulated—even that the religious life of many is modelled on a Catholic form, avails little. The luxury of the age may account for much of the first; the very reaction from such luxury may, perhaps, account for the second. But, while the Catholic truth which underlies both is as hotly denied by some in the Establishment as it is eagerly maintained by others, we can only reassert our opening statement—viz., that the principal result of the Tractarian movement, putting aside its happier effect in leading many souls into the Church, is simply to bring another element of discordant teaching into the Anglican body; and that, so far as the movement aspired to prove her to be one with the Church of Christ throughout the world, it failed disastrously.

EVELYN MORDAUNT.

THE APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER.—II.

ITS SIMPLICITY AND USEFULNESS.

THE Holy League of the Sacred Heart has been, as already said,¹ approved of by Pope Pius IX. of blessed memory, by the present supreme Pontiff, even while he was still but Archbishop of Perugia; while during the twelve years of his pontificate he has advocated, encouraged, and blessed it in no less than eight successive briefs or rescripts.

We have even higher advocacy and approval. Our Blessed Lord, desirous to see established this beautiful form of devotion to His Adorable Heart, has, in a series of sacred promises, declared how He Himself regards it. To those who practice this devotion, He promised blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque that He would give:—

1. The graces necessary for their state.
2. Peace in their families.
3. Comfort in all their trials.
4. Secure refuge in life and death.
5. Abundant blessings on all their undertakings.
6. That sinners should find His Heart an ocean of mercy.
7. That tepid souls should become fervent.
8. That fervent souls should advance rapidly towards perfection.
9. That He would bless every dwelling where an image of His Heart should be exposed and honoured.
10. That He would give priests a peculiar facility for converting hardened sinners.
11. That persons spreading this devotion should have their names written in His Sacred Heart, never to be effaced.

It is hardly necessary to stay to speak on the authenticity of these promises. In two ways, the Church has implicitly guaranteed their authenticity; first, in beatifying Blessed Margaret Mary, who declared that our divine Lord made these promises; and secondly, in approving

¹ See I. E. RECORD, Oct., 1891.

of the devotion that makes these promises one of its promoting factors. And to these two may be added the further one, that they are spoken and taught, not in secret, but preached and published off the house-tops; and that the Church, so sensitive to everything tainted with false doctrine, has not thought it necessary to qualify or condemn them, but has permitted and encouraged them. Surely, then, for persons desirous to secure their eternal salvation, here is at hand a means marvellous "in its usefulness and in its simplicity," to use the words of Leo XIII., when Archbishop of Perugia.

Two questions now come to the front—how may a person, individually, become a member of it? and how may a priest, anxious to establish it in his parish, go about doing so? The first question is easily answered; the person has but to find where the Association is established—every Jesuit Church has one connected with it, as well as numbers of convents and parishes—and to give his name to be enrolled in the register. There are three degrees. By the first and simplest, he is required, besides giving his name, to make the Morning offering. By the second, he is asked, furthermore, to say one decade of the Rosary daily for the *Monthly Intention*. By the third, he binds himself to a monthly or a weekly Holy Communion of Reparation. In joining, one may become a member only of the first degree, if he wish; but he could not be a member without having his name on the register, and making the Morning offering; and on his habitually neglecting to make the Morning offering he would cease to become a member; because the Morning offering is the fundamental devotion underlying all. Therefore, if he wishes to be a member at all, he must make the Morning offering; and the more earnestly and devotedly he makes it, the truer member he is, the more fervent he becomes in his own soul, the more dear to the Sacred Heart, and the more powerful for obtaining blessings from God for the Association and for all its members. This will be seen at a glance by taking a case. Supposing that one of the things to be prayed for on to-morrow morning is, "5,000 persons out of employment;" plainly, the prayers of the earnest member will have

more influence before the throne of grace, than that of the tepid, in obtaining employment for these poor men and their families, and thus in keeping them from starvation, and perhaps other, and (it may be) worse evils.

Besides the Monthly Intention, which is broad and general, and which is usually selected by the Pope himself, as, for instance, the *Peace of Nations*, *Catholicity of the Press*, &c., there are those daily and local and personal intentions, which the associates ask the Central Director to pray for, and which he thus groups together, and appoints a certain group for one day in the month, another for another, and so on. These the associates find printed on the last page of *The Messenger*, or on what is called *The General Intention Sheet*. The zealous member keeps these requests before his eyes—reads them at night before going to bed, in order that they may be in his mind when he is making his offering in the morning; puts himself into the place of those who have made these requests, who have sent up these cries from (in all likelihood) bleeding hearts; and thus he excites his devotion, and prays and works more earnestly and more fruitfully.

It is written: "And behold a certain lawyer stood up, tempting Him . . . and, willing to justify himself, said to Jesus, Who is my neighbour?" Upon this our Blessed Lord told the beautiful parable of the Good Samaritan, who, seeing the sick man, "was moved with compassion, and going up to him, bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine." This is what the fervent member of the Holy League does every morning when praying for his neighbour who "hath fallen among robbers." We know with what implied eulogy our Lord narrates that touching parable, and with what admonition He says to every generation and to every man: "Go thou, and do likewise." And in this our day He has gone farther, for He has particularized the blessings He is prepared to give to those who will do so: "I will give them the graces necessary for their state. I will give them peace in their families. I will be their secure refuge in life and death. I will give them comfort in all their trials, and bestow abundant blessings on all their undertakings."

From the individual it is but a step to the parish. A parish of such souls is a picture that the mind loves to contemplate; the fleece of Gideon, anew, wet with the dews of heaven on the thrashing-floor "under an oak that was in Ephra;"—"as the smell of a plentiful field which the Lord hath blessed"—so would such a parish be.

Article VII. of the Statutes says:—

"The General Director may, in different countries and dioceses, appoint Central Directors, with the consent of the respective Ordinary, whose jurisdiction, moreover, must always be scrupulously respected, both with regard to centres established or to be established, or with regard to the faithful of his diocese, already enrolled or to be enrolled, according to the holy canons and apostolic constitutions."

This directs how to act in the case of a parish. The first thing to be obtained is the consent of the Ordinary. In this matter, it will not be difficult to obtain it. Nothing can be more welcome to those "who are set over us, so as to give an account of us," than to learn that we are desirous to live fervent Catholic lives, which is testified by our intention of joining the League of the Sacred Heart. That consent being obtained, the next step is to notify the same to the Central Director in Dublin.

This is the most convenient place to describe the internal government of the Association.

The General Director, who has supreme authority over the Association throughout the whole world, lives in France. He appoints, in every country, zealous clergymen who have a deep interest in the Association, and a great desire to advance it, and who are called Central Directors—one for every country, one for England, one for Ireland, &c. These Central Directors have the power of appointing, with the sanction of the Ordinary, as determined by the statutes, Local Directors, whose jurisdiction is generally conterminous with the parishes.

The Local Director, having obtained his diploma, proceeds to organize in whatever way he, in his judgment, considers best. Possibly, the best way would be, to explain, in one or two lectures, the advantages of the Association, and then invite members to join.

As in all things, so in this, our Lord seems greatly to desire the assistance of priests. In order to induce them to give their aid, He promises things which usually He bestows only on saints. "I will give priests a peculiar facility for converting hardened sinners." And, best of all, "Persons spreading this devotion, I will have their names *written in My Sacred Heart, never to be effaced.*" The worth of this promise may be judged from what our Lord, in the Gospel, says to the seventy-two disciples on their return to Him. "And they coming together unto Jesus, related unto Him all things that they had done and taught." His answer was, not to glory in the wonderful miracles they had wrought, or in the numbers that they had converted; but to rejoice in this, that *their names were written in the book of life.*

From the number enrolled, or from those who have helped to spread the devotion, the Local Director will choose persons of earnestness, of steadiness, and of zeal; and on these the great success of the work will depend. "The promoters hold their meetings once a month," says the little handbook of the Holy League; "and on these meetings the spread of the Association, the success of all its works, the fervour of its members, &c., mainly depend."

Every member, at joining, gets a certificate of admission. Blank forms are supplied from the office of the Central Director.¹ Promoters also get diplomas. They are received with certain ceremonies, all of which may be found by consulting the handbook.

Thus it appears how very simple in its construction, and how very self-acting it is. In the parish, the Local Director works through the Promoters, and they act on the members. And what is it not capable of effecting in a parish? Whether a work be one duly subordinated to it, or a religious movement which, at first sight, seems quite foreign and even alien, it readily unites and assimilates with all; for all things that are holy are dear to the Heart of Jesus. If it be the Propagation of the faith, it gathers it under its wings, as a

¹ In Ireland the office is at No. 5, Great Denmark-street, Dublin.

hen gathereth her chickens; if it be devotion to the Holy Souls, it as readily assists it. If it be temporal or moral virtues, such as the promotion of family peace, the blessings of domestic cleanliness among the poor, or the great advantage of temperance, nothing comes amiss to it; it is there, not alone present, but the "brightness of God shining all round, and with *it* a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth to men of goodwill."

It is hardly possible to calculate all the good work it may do in a parish. By its beautiful tender devotion to the Sacred Heart, it brings souls to our Lord in the Holy Communion, thus inducing a more frequent reception of the holy Sacraments of Penance and the Blessed Eucharist. Children take immediately to it; and no one need be told what is the advantage of binding the child to the altar and the Church. The growing-up young men, and the brave heart in the strong man's breast, yield with childlike softness to its pleadings. "His locks are wet with the dews of the night." There is something sublimely pathetic in seeing the power of religion exercised on the strong and the robust. God's eye may see many a Nathanael praying beneath the fig-tree, when our eyes cannot. What more rugged or unpromising than the fishermen that cast their nets in an Eastern sea? Yet that same Sacred Heart said to them but once, "Follow Me! And leaving their nets they followed Him."

Overlooking many, there is one devotion so peculiarly the devotion of the Sacred Heart, and called into existence and all but universal observance by it, that it cannot be passed unmentioned—the devotion of the first Friday of every month, and the consequent devotion of the Nine Fridays. The devotion of the first Friday has gained already such a hold on the piety of the people, that were we by any chance restored to the ages of faith, it is likely that it would have been postulated for as a holiday. With the exception of Christmas Day and some feasts of our Blessed Lady, there is scarcely any other on which the faithful feel such an abundance of love and outpouring of the Holy

Ghost, the Comforter, as on the first Friday. Scarcely anything seems so hard to be borne by those who are in the habit of going to Holy Communion on the first Friday, as being disappointed on that day. The nine Fridays naturally follow from this. But then there is that extraordinary promise of our Blessed Lord—exceptional, indeed, in the whole history of the Christian Church—with regard to the nine Fridays. It has not been recorded that any promise like the following was ever made :—

“I promise thee, in the excess of the mercy of My Heart, that its all-powerful love will grant to all those who receive communion on the first Friday of the month for nine consecutive months, *the grace of final repentance* ; and that they shall not die under My displeasure, nor without receiving the sacraments ; and that My heart shall be their secure refuge at that last hour.”

It is no wonder that there was a great outcry against this promise when it was first made public. All the teachings of mystic theology were against it, or seemed to be so. *Final perseverance* was not to be merited, but to be obtained by humble and constant prayer. Churchmen, with their habit of caution, looked suspicious. It was new ; it was startling ; it was previously unheard-of : but the love and the mercy of the Sacred Heart have no bounds. To-day, thank God, under the sanction of Holy Church, it is preached everywhere ; *in omnem terram exivit sonus ejus*.

The devotion of the first Friday, and the devotion of the nine Fridays, seem to culminate in “that day which the Lord hath made,” the first Friday after the Octave of Corpus Christi, the feast of the Sacred Heart. Let us recall its institution as told in the delightful pages of Père Charles Daniel, de la Compagnie de Jesus :—

“In the little chapel of the Visitation [at Paray-le-Monial] Father de la Colombiere was celebrating the holy mysteries with more than his usual fervour and devotion. About the time of Holy Communion, when blessed Margaret Mary was going to approach the altar, she saw two hearts, the priest’s and her own, immersed in the Sacred Heart of Jesus, as if they were spots in a great furnace ; and she heard a voice, saying : ‘It is thus that My pure love unites three hearts for ever.’”

At the same time she understood that this union was

all for the glory of the Sacred Heart, and that she was to inform the holy priest of its treasures, in order that he might justly appreciate it, and value the spiritual gifts that were to be shared between them. . . . What was not the astonishment of Father de la Colombiere to find himself chosen by our divine Saviour to aid in obtaining glory for the Sacred Heart. He was so confounded, when she told him, and expressed himself in terms of such humiliation, that the holy nun says she was more edified by what she saw and heard than by the most eloquent and the most pious discourses of this true servant of God.

“To add a new feast to the feasts of the Church! this frightened her. But to add one more to that which had been added in the thirteenth century in honour of the adorable Body and Blood of our Lord; to the joy and exultation of the *Lauda Sion*, to add penance and reparation—this was the thought ever uppermost in her mind. Long time had she nursed it, but never would she have ventured to breathe it across her lips but for the express command of our divine Lord. While she lay prostrate before the altar, and while she was revolving what could she do to make the Sacred Heart better known and loved, she heard a voice, saying: ‘You shall never do better than what I have so often asked of you;’ and then: ‘Behold this Heart that has loved men so much, that it has not even stopped at consuming and annihilating itself to testify its love for men; and from the most of them I receive nothing but ingratitude; for they do not cease to offend Me by their irreverences and by their sacrileges, as well as by the coldness and the contempt which they show to Me in this sacrament of love. But what is still more painful is, that there are hearts even consecrated to Me, who do this. It is for this reason that I ask of you to obtain that the first Friday after the octave of the holy sacrament be dedicated by particular devotion to the honour of My Heart, that the faithful receive Holy Communion on that day, and by a loving reparation to My Sacred Heart that they make amends for all the indignities it receives while exposed for the adoration of men. *And I promise you that My divine Heart will shed in abundance the sacred influence of its love on all who pay it this honour, and who will procure it to be paid.*’ When she related all this to Father de la Colombiere, he did not hesitate for a moment. Too happy to be the first disciple of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, he made an entire sacrifice of himself, and on the next day he engaged by vow to devote the remainder of his life to the service of the Sacred Heart. That was the first Friday after the Octave of Corpus Christi, June 21, 1675.”

In the year 1765 Clement XIII., to the great joy of the Christian world, solemnly approved of the devotion to the Sacred Heart; and in 1873, Pope Pius IX. of blessed memory, writing to the Irish bishops, cried: "May the Sacred Heart of Jesus inflame your hearts! Amen."

J. A. CULLEN, S.J.

HUMOURING THE VATICAN IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

"Dans la sphère sereine de la science, lorsque le temps a calmé les passions pourquoi ne pas avouer des torts qui ne sont plus que des faits historiques?"—(PIERLING, *Papes et Tsars*, avant propos, page 1.)

SCHLITTE! Who or what was Schlitte? Readers of the *Romans Nationaux* of Erckmann-Chatrian will find somewhere in *Madame Thérèse* much anxiety about a schlitte; but our Schlitte is not a thing, but a man. Schlitte was the man who humoured the Vatican in the sixteenth century; to whose character we hope, before we finish this article, to do full justice. We do not know if Schlitte was the great prototype of more recent adventurers, but he was unique. His interesting career will now be, for the first time, unfolded to English readers, as a warning to all his followers who feel inclined to play tricks with the Catholic Church, and to humour the Vicar of Christ, that the time comes when they will be duly gibbeted.

To grasp clearly the position of affairs in Europe at the time of which we speak, we must take a retrospective glance at the general drift of European politics. First of all the religious question was of supreme importance. The East was separated from the West by what was *prima facie* a schism, but at bottom a heresy. Greek and Latin were in hostile camps. The estrangement was fatal. The Greeks saw a sinister sign on their eastern horizon. The Turk was coming, and now the hour of Byzantium had come. While

the West was holding its great Councils of Lyons and Florence, Islam was sharpening its sword beyond the Bosphorus and casting its eye toward Constantinople. On one side the Turk, on another Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily; while the Ex-Emperor Baldwin II. menaced them from another point. The Greeks were in straits. Whither should they turn for help but to the Vatican? The Greeks were isolated in religion, and the enemy was knocking at the gates. What was to be done? Michael Paleologus sent to implore the help of the Latins, and the Pope immediately moved in the direction of religious unity; join Latin and Greek in the Church, and let them draw the sword together against the common enemy, Islam. In 1274 Gregory convoked the Council of Lyons—the questions between East and West were discussed—on the 6th of July. East and West were united; the Greeks swearing loyalty to the Pope in recognising Papal supremacy. The union, such as it was, lasted a very short time. When Michael Paleologus died the rupture was the same as had prevailed from Photius to the Council of Lyons.

The Turk was growing more powerful day by day, and the Greeks were asking for men and money. Once more the emperors of Byzantine are thrown into the arms of the Pope. Islamism was rampant; the Greek Empire trembling; nothing could save New Rome but the West; and the Pope was the West. We are now in the middle of the fifteenth century. The Emperor, John Paleologus stretches his hands to Rome, to implore help before the eastern rampart of Christianity would be blotted out in Christian blood, under the ever-increasing tide of Mohammedanism. Terms of union between East and West were again proposed: a Council was hastily summoned—first at Ferrara, then at Florence. Bessarion (the sight of whose Roman purple, as cardinal, on his return home, so nearly cost him his life), a theologian, an orator, and a patriot; and Isidore of Kief, a man of boundless energy, of solid judgment, one of those noble men whose wisdom comes from afar, represented the Greeks, At length Eugene IV., 1439, published the Decree of Union, and appealed to all Christian princes to fly to the rescue of the Catholic Church in the East. Nicholas V. did the same.

It was too late. The Crescent triumphed; Constantine was defeated, and Constantinople became the head-quarters of the Turks. From that day to this the Asiatic barbarian has held on to the Golden Horn, and blighted by his presence one of the fairest spots of Europe.

The Turks now became a danger to Europe. The Greek emperors and Constantinople were gone. The Dukes of Moscow—later on, the Tsars of Russia—remained. The Pope turned to Moscow for help against the Turks, and his object was this: On the disappearance of Constantinople with its patriarchate as a Christian city, the centre of Eastern influence was being rapidly transferred. Under Moslem power the Patriarch of Constantinople became a skeleton, and the Russians asked themselves, "How shall we obey a patriarch in the hands of the Moslems?" Constantinople was second Rome; Moscow was to be third Rome. Keeping in touch with Moscow was the only way to secure large armies against the Turk, and to prepare the way for another attempt to unite the East and West. Rome had not much to give Moscow. True, the Pope could make the Duke of Moscow Tsar (Cæsar) of the North—send him a royal crown, confer high-sounding titles which would please the Kremlin, and, above all, he could intervene with the Poles, in a sense favourable to Russia.

In those days, during the sixteenth century, when Schlitte makes his appearance, Poland was mighty. She stood there in the very heart of Europe, a bulwark of Christianity, when the Greek empire had gone, when Germany and England were simply rotting and festering in heresy, and when the Turk was still threatening, not Greek—for practical purpose it had disappeared—but Latin Christianity. She was a great Slavonic power, and from the earliest days of the Moscow Dukedom, when it began to assimilate the surrounding princedoms, such as Suzdal and Novogorod, she saw that the Tsar of the North was to be the great rival power which would eventually cross swords with her, and unite, if possible, under one crown the great Slav race. Would Poland conquer, and assert that the crown of the Jagellons be the symbol of the Mid-European unity of the Slavs, or would the candlestick

be removed to Moscow? In addition, during the great Mongolian invasion across the Ural chain, the Poles took Livonia, a province over which the Russians claimed suzerainty. Hence mistrust, suspicion, hatred, thinly disguised under the most formal diplomatic reserve.

Rome now comes on the scene, and diplomatic overtures were made to Russia to rally against the Turk, and to reunite East and West. It was not the first time that there were cordial relations between the Vatican and the Kremlin. Through the instrumentality of the Vatican, Zoe Paleologa, daughter of the last Emperor of Byzantium, a Catholic princess, was married to Ivan III. An Italian from Vicenza, Gian Battista della Volpe, represented Ivan (the marriage was in Rome by proxy), and escorted the fair bride through Italy to Moscow with all that courtesy and delicate finesse which the grandeur of the occasion evoked in the soul of the chivalrous Italian. Embassies came and went from Rome to Moscow and from Moscow to Rome, but always with the same result. The Tsar and the Turk were friends, and Russia was not in danger. Hungary was the objective of Soliman. During all these comings and goings between the Popes and Tsars, Poland was profoundly moved lest something prejudicial to her interests should be determined on. Thus, in the middle of the sixteenth century there was in the diplomatic world a triangular duel between the Pope and the Tsar and the King of Poland. At this point Schlitte appeared. From what we have said, it will be easy to infer what were the ideas and aims of the various courts concerned. Moscow aimed at being free from Rome religiously, but desired to take advantage of western civilization, which in all the arts, both useful and ornamental, found their focus in Rome and their sphere of influence in the western nations. Rome and the western nations saw more and more clearly the necessity of having religious unity to combat impending dangers. Moscow preferred autonomy in religion—independence from the Pope: two sets of ideas prevailed in the East and in the West, and Hans Schlitte knew how to utilize both.

A native of Goslar, an old town in the district of Liebenbourg, province of Hanover, Schlitte seeks his fortune among

the Russians. He was a man of active mind, and spoke Russian well—a rare acquirement in those days. He turns up at Moscow full of Moscovian ideas, gets introduced to the Tsar Ivan IV., and begins his interesting career. He is a Greek out and out at Moscow, though a Catholic generally outside the Russian frontier : geographical Christianity was obviously a strong point with him. He could feel equally at home in the Kremlin and at the Vatican. The Tsar gave him a commission to go to Germany, and recruit among the Germans an efficient body of men to teach the Russians *sciences, arts, and crafts*. He was granted letters patent to that effect, and turned his face westward, in April, 1547. The Russians wanted men of this class and none other. But a mere commission to recruit teachers of manual sciences would not be very imposing in the eyes of the Western Catholics, to whom a union of Churches was the only point of importance, both on its own account, and as a preliminary to an anti-Islamic league. Schlitte presents himself to Charles V. of Germany, whose dream was a great Catholic league. Charles V. had reason to see its importance, owing to the pressing troubles which Protestantism caused in Germany. In 1548, having been triumphant over all Protestant opposition, he was particularly disposed in that direction.

Under such circumstances Schlitte makes his appearance at the Diet of Augsburg, and announces himself at the German Court as the *Russian Ambassador*. He fills the brain of Charles V. with wonderful tales of Ivan IV's disposition towards the union of the Latin and Greek Churches ; how he is desirous of following in the steps of the late Tsar, his father Vasili, and of submitting directly to the Latin Church. Charles V. was fired by this information, and readily accorded to Schlitte an instrument conferring full power on him to gather all the learned men he could find, and would want to take to Moscow. Charles also gives him a letter to the Tsar, praising the latter for his efforts towards a high civilization, &c., but never mentions a word about the union of the Churches. The result of Schlitte's enterprise was a mixed gathering of one hundred and twenty-three luminaries, who started out from their homes, true knight-errants of learning,

bent on making their lights shine across the wastes of Scythia. Among the gathering are four theologians—of what prowess we know not. The Tsar never asked for theologians—no mention of them in the letters patent containing Schlitte's commission, to which Schlitte appealed—no mention of them in Charles V.'s eulogistic letter to the Tsar. But their presence is readily explained. Schlitte had a game to play, and he was playing it. The four theologians were obviously necessary to give colour, not to the contents of the letters patent—but to the wonderful prospect of the union of East and West, about which Schlitte had so much to say. The long train of western brains trending towards Moscow, headed by Schlitte, with the four theologians in front, was a touching sight. But our best plans—such are the limitations of human genius—sometimes go askew, and Schlitte was no exception. Even the theologians were unable to secure that immunity which bards and minstrels of better days were able to enjoy. The contingent of learned men infringed on the Livonian frontier; and the Poles, respecting neither the pacific character of a body of men whose sole avocation was to spread the light and extend the frontier of the realm of thought, nor the passport of their leader, cast him into prison at Lübeck, where for two years he had time to think of the ingratitude of a generation which was wont to imprison its best benefactors, and how he was to extricate himself from the Polish dungeon. When he came forth and looked around, lo! the splendid galaxy of talent, which had set out with such high hopes, had vanished, and Schlitte found himself once more “on the bleak shore alone.” Whither his staff of professors went, we know not. Escaped from prison, by miracle, he assures us, and being pursued by the Poles, he is saved by a special intervention of Providence, as he again assures us. Without a penny in his pocket, or anything available for his daily wants but his ingenuity, he once more sets out to play off the East against the West. His first move was to create a chancellor. John Steinberg was an Austrian gentleman, whose purse was much heavier than his head. Schlitte wanted money; Steinberg, something to do. Perhaps the

latter had lurking ambition to be something important, and wished to turn a position of imposing grandeur to account. So Schlitte, fresh from jail, by a special instrument confers a hitherto unheard-of dignity on Steinberg, who forthwith becomes the "Latin and German Chancellor" and Plenipotentiary delegate of the Tsar to treat of all Russian affairs, but above all to negotiate the union of the Latin and Greek Churches between the Emperor and the Pope. Schlitte plans the movements of his chancellor. Steinberg is commissioned to go to Rome, and get a brief of union, "*sub annulo Piscatoris*," return with it to Breslau, where a passport to Moscow will be ready for him. Then he can go to Moscow, where he can for ever bask in the sunshine of the Tsar's favour, *and have his cash reimbursed*. Steinberg was paying his own expenses in this transaction, and there is very little doubt that the *soi-disant* ambassador was enjoying himself very comfortably out of Steinberg's purse as well.

This happy arrangement shows Schlitte's versatility. He broke new ground, and was able to make something solid, tangible, and practicable—to wit, cash—out of the very airiest speculations. Less ingenious men would have contented themselves with a more modest enterprise, and have picked up an agreeable living out of anti-camera intrigues; but Schlitte would have no such grovelling baseness—something dashing and brilliant for the intrepid Goslarian; something that would strike by its boldness, and silence wretched cavillers by its colossal grandeur. Of course, he knew that popes had laboured in vain for the same object; that councils had been held; that emperors had been wrecked on the same spot; that cardinals had retired broken hearted from discussing history and canons of ancient councils and abstruse questions on the nature of the hypostasis and the operations *ad extra et ad intra*; that bishops prayed and laboured; that the whole ground which separated East and West had for whole generations of men been trodden as hard as a barracks-yard; but he was not craven-hearted. He still held that, properly exploited, the great question afforded ample material for further enterprise.

That all it required was a man of talent and resource to present to the human race a very rare spectacle. Schlitte was that man; and notice, that so far he proceeded on orthodox lines. Heroes have their poets; literary men their valets; knights their squires; and why should not Schlitte have his chancellor? So Steinberg appears in all his wild glory—created by Schlitte by a very formidable document bearing seals—not Russian ones—but the seals of some obscure Austrian officials, Weisberg and Raugen—doubtless good Catholics, who foresaw in Schlitte's noble enterprise the first step toward putting heavy Russian battalions on the flanks of the Turks.

Now we have arrived at a certain point. Steinberg and Schlitte separate. The former faces Romeward, while Schlitte hovers about to watch results. So far Schlitte was not compromised with the Tsar, in whose name these remarkable performances were being done. Schlitte's scheme was vague: Steinberg defines it, and the negotiations in Rome result in some startling developments. We can either follow Steinberg to Rome, or Schlitte. Let us for the present follow up his agent, promising to finish with Schlitte. Steinberg was for Schlitte a happy selection. He was a man of the wildest enthusiasm, practical in details, not given to abstract observations: neither dreamy in head nor vapoury in speech. He was well known in Vienna, and enjoyed the favour of the Papal Nuncio, Pietro Bertano, who was so captivated with Steinberg's enterprise, and so unsuspecting about the Chancellor's dignity that there was no time for anything beyond wishing God-speed, and preparing the Pope for Steinberg's arrival. Steinberg was now on the high road to eminence and success. That he was *bonâ fide*, is plain from the wonderful enthusiasm with which he begins and carries through his operations. He fires the imagination of Bertano, who writes to Rome a glowing account of the plan for the union of East and West. This settles Steinberg's reception in Rome. Bertano's influence in matters Russian was unequalled, and when once the illustrious Dominican bishop took sides with Steinberg, the success of the chancellor's

mission to Rome was certain, as far as human plans could make it.

To strengthen his back still more, and to make the scheme hang well together, Schlitte procured letters to the same purpose from Charles V. to the Pope. Orders were sent to the emperor's Imperial Ambassador at Rome, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, to advise him on the matter in hand, and to facilitate as far as possible the success of Steinberg's mission. Charles V. and Bertano informed the Pope that the Tsar was embarrassed at the religious differences which prevailed in Poland, where the Latin and Greek rites prevailed; and he was therefore obliged, in the interests of religious unity, the desire of which was burning out his soul, to speed his "Latin and German Chancellor" to Rome. When Steinberg arrived in Rome he was the most important man there. Certain ancient plenipotentiaries came long distances to Rome, and carried peace or war in the folds of their Carthaginian robes; but Schlitte's chancellor carried the Russian Church, the success of the Council of Trent, the fate of Islam, and many other consequential schemes big with the destiny of the future. Rome was then on the *qui vive*. The Reformation was a heavy blow; and at that moment it was in full swing. St. Ignatius of Loyola, with his magnificent Jesuits, were on the breach. St. Peter's barque was in the midst of the tempest and the boiling sea; but by the special providence of God the Jesuits were on deck. We have said by the providence of God, for if ever a *Deus ex machina* sprang up in the hour of need, when the knot demanded the power of a God to unravel it, you have it in the establishing of the Jesuit Order in the Abbey Church of Montmartre, 1533.

When Steinberg came to Rome, the idea gained ground that the losses should be made good elsewhere. The Russian chancellor turns in through the Porta del Popolo at the psychological moment, and sits down to business with the Roman diplomats. Bertano appears later on in the Roman purple. The idea gained ground that Russia was safe, and Steinberg was surrounded by a mysterious halo, nimbussed in the eyes of the diplomatic world of Rome. He formulated his plan, and counted largely on the credence and

want of information of the Russian Court. Nothing could be simpler. Moscow was throbbing for union—that, of course, came from Schlitte: Rome was equally anxious—that came from Bertano; and even if it did not it was notorious. Steinberg sketches a plan of adjustment on the *quid pro quo* principle. He was to get a brief of union as a *certificate delivered beforehand* to the Tsar that the Tsar and the Russian Church *would be received into the Catholic Church on equitable conditions*. This was clearly a remarkable way of doing business even there; but it seems not to have created any doubts in the souls of the Pope's advisers. They were dealing with Schlitte's chancellor, to whom Schlitte had given confidentially the most boundless authority, to which the powers of any ordinary diplomat of the day would have been narrow and cramped and frizzled up in the extreme. A plenipotentiary of that power was not to be met with every day, and Rome was too busy making the most of her opportunity to attend to little peculiarities of procedure which were relatively of no importance.

The bogus chancellor also wanted—(a) a royal crown for the Tsar, and (b) to make Moscow a Primatial See; and for this there was a vague hint of an anti-Islamic league and a new balance of power in Europe.

This scheme in itself had its *vraisemblance*. The Tsar was a prince, and was not crowned. The Greek Church wanted an archbishop outside the influence of the Turks. The Tsar and the Primate of Moscow would swear beforehand to labour for the re-union of the rank and file of the Russian people. The conversion of the Russians would not have been a great difficulty if Ivan IV. wanted it; but he neither wanted it nor the crown, which formed Schlitte's base-line of operations. The diplomatists, however, kept going on, not with lightning rapidity, but in the fine old traditional way of the Roman Curia—slowly and gently. A special commission was at length appointed, and the commission was not over precipitous in its action. Five cardinals—Cervini, Pacieco, du Puy, Maffei, and Pighini—were appointed to take charge of the “Latin and German Chancellor,” whose style of business now begins to be

more remarkable than ever. Steinberg began to put in a condition that *he himself* should be appointed Envoy Extraordinary of the Pope to go to Moscow, and to have ratified by Ivan the stipulations entered into between himself and the Papal Court. The fact was, that he wanted to play his own game out—a game well known in Italy—*altalena*—and the swing was to be from Rome to Moscow and from Moscow to Rome. We do not accuse him of duplicity—far from it: but he was wonderfully educated by Schlitte, and Schlitte's education put his pupil quite on a level with the keen prelates and cardinals who were *au courant* with the progress of business in the Russo-Roman negotiation. Thus far in mysterious secrecy.

At length (1552), by order of the Pope, Cardinal Maffei handed over copies of the official documents which Steinberg brought with him to Rome, under the same secrecy which had enveloped the proceedings from the beginning, to Konarski. Konarski was the Polish ambassador in Rome, and a Russo-phobe. Being invited to dine with Cardinal de Medicis, he was asked what he thought of the Russian Question. He replied by reading some pages of Herbertstein. Unfortunately for Steinberg, Herbertstein was the very man who was to accompany the chancellor to Moscow for the ratification of the Roman stipulations. He was a very shrewd Austrian diplomatist, and had great influence in all Mid-European affairs of state. Among other things he said was one that ruined Steinberg's career. He said that Vasili III. of Moscow hated the Pope more than he hated any other man. Steinberg built his great diplomatic structure on Vasili's benevolent dispositions. And here the great diplomatic bubble was pricked by the very man whom the chancellor has selected as his great colleague in the journey to Moscow, and the signing, sealing, and delivering of the conditions of union between East and West. The thrust went home. Steinberg was informed that his mission would conclude in three days. He packed his baggage, and was on the point of starting, when two cardinals advised him to hold on. Cardinal Maffei, Protector of Poland, died, and Steinberg, seeing in this a ray of hope, held on. Once more the

intrepid Steinberg is on the back stairs of the Vatican, and finds his way to the Pope's Confessor, who introduces him to Cardinal de Cuppis, Archbishop of Trani and Dean of the Sacred College. Discredited in Rome, repudiated by Charles V., who had patronized him, and Bertano being now dead, he is as imperturbable as ever. Despatch after despatch flows from his prolific pen; he writes up, not only his own side of the case, but does the answering as well, and litters his cabinet with copious instructions to be furnished to everybody concerned—to the Papal Ambassadors, to the Emperor Charles, to the King of Poland, to the Roman cardinals, and sketches out, with his daring pen, Papal letters to be sent by the Pope to the Tsar and the "Archbishop of Moscow." Ultimately Cardinal de Cuppis died (December 10th, 1553), and the Steinberg fraud was so completely shattered that quite suddenly the "German and Latin Chancellor" disappears from the suburbs of the Vatican; and disappears so suddenly and absolutely, that when Pius V., in 1570, was asked what had become of the Steinberg negotiations, he could only say that he did not know. The Vatican had been humoured, and explanations, at once painful and needless, would not have sufficed to dissipate the unsavoury remembrance of the buccaneering chancellor foisted on them by Schlitte's bold policy. Thus far Steinberg.

Turn we now to Schlitte. When Steinberg left for Rome, the "Russian Ambassador" (he never, even when his stomach was as empty as his purse, forgot his dignity) remained behind to register developments. Would Steinberg succeed? If so, of course Schlitte would head the triumphal procession to Moscow, where Ivan IV. would get the Royal Crown, prestige, strength against the Poles, with Moscow the headquarters of Slavism, and would give nothing. Would Steinberg fail? Then Steinberg's failure would not be Schlitte's failure,

Dolce è mirar dal lido
Chi sta per naufragar;

and he could return to Moscow without the danger of having

his head chopped off, or at least being knouted. What easier than to repudiate with indignation the indefatigable chancellor whom he created by his own fiat, and whose documents he sealed with Austrian seals. Whatever way this manœuvre ended, Schlitte was sure to come on his feet. He never compromised himself; he never went to Rome; he never left the frontier countries where he was sent to recruit the professors who came to grief at Lübeck. Whatever befel his chancellor, his fingers were not burned with the hot chestnuts. He made money out of it. And that is all the adventurer wanted. The best of our diplomatists look for political advantages when they send missions to Rome. That Schlitte made money of it, shows that he had the peculiarity of preferring cash, good Austrian florins, or Roman scudi, to the mere ephemeral and windy advantages which one political party gains over another. That this phase of the question had its attractions for Schlitte, is only too obvious: indeed the thinness of the whole business gives it such a transparency, that, in spite of the secrecy with which financial transactions of a shaky kind are usually conducted, a certain mercenary atmosphere surrounds the whole proceeding. For instance, Count Philip d'Eberstein offers Steinberg all the needful money, provided that when he would go to Rome he would secure for him possession of the old abbey of Würtenburg from the Pope. Such an offer would not be lost, if Schlitte had a free hand. Steinberg had money, Schlitte had none. The offer was to Schlitte's chancellor, and a man of genius like Schlitte would not be embarrassed for want of a principle to annex all the money the Count was willing to spend. *Qui facit per alium facit per se; partus sequitur ventrem*—something—whoever gives to Steinberg gives to Schlitte—and, of course, the money would be safe until they would all get back to Moscow.

But back to Schlitte. During the Steinberg negotiations he lay low; but he was not idle. He kept his ears open, and bided his time. He heard of Steinberg's doings—for Schlitte always moved in diplomatic society; he knew how Poland was alarmed lest Rome and Russia should enter a compact detrimental to their country; he knew the latest movement

of the Emperor Charles V., the final decision of Pope Julius III., and the final smash-down of his chancellor, and when this last information reached his ears he at length discovered that there was nothing more to be made out of the question ; so, without creating any more chancellors, as he did not want them, or without condoling with the one he did create, he turned his eyes towards holy Russia (1554).

He now appears in a new character. We remember how enthusiastic he was about the conversion of Russia to the Catholic faith. Rome was everything to him then ; he wrote fluently and touchingly about Rome and the Pope. Rome was the loadstone of his soul ; and as it suited his purpose to say it, he said it. He was quite willing to undergo any suffering, any labour for the union of the East with Rome.

“ Romains j’aime ta gloire, et ne veux point m’en taire,
Des travaux des hommes c’est le digne salaire
Ce n’est qu’en vous servant qu’il la faut acheter
Qui n’ose la vouloir, n’ose la meriter.”

He did both, but when he recovered he wanted his fare to Russia, and a safe conduct to recommend him to the policemen on the way. And this champion of Rome who was beslaving Rome with his fulsome adulation and his lying pretensions, and his hypocrisy, writes for a safe conduct to Christian III. at Copenhagen. His reminiscences of Lübeck were not of the kind that get embalmed in the memory, so he resolved to leave Lübeck far beyond the horizon and return to Moscow *via* Denmark. In Russia he was a Greek ; in Germany, before Charles V., a pious Catholic ; he is now a Protestant. He sends his courier, Barwert Berner, to Copenhagen, with a long letter to Christian. He recounts his royal munificence, the royal virtues, the royal protection afforded to the oppressed, and deplores the barbarism of the holy Empire, where he suffered so much for justice’ sake ; where nobody shielded him from persecution, because Christian was not there. He wisely abstains from any reference to the Steinberg enterprise. He knew Christian III. He was an active reformer. He protected bad Catholics wherever they were. Luther was an apostate, and Christian supplies him with pocket money ; he gave Melancthon an

allowance ; and allowed Bugenhagen his travelling expenses. Why not help another good Protestant like Schlitte ? Why not give him a simple safe-conduct, and help him through to go back to his master Ivan IV., who was longing to see him at the Kremlin, where Christian's name for the aforesaid concession to an "ambassador" in distress would be cherished in grateful benediction for ever and ever ? Still more : he assures Christian that Ivan was quite ready to become a Protestant. All he wanted was a few good learned Protestant doctors, like Dr. Luther, and the thing was done. But all was of no avail. Denmark and Russia were bad friends, and Christian politely informed him that, not knowing the intentions of his "very particular friend," the Tsar, he did not wish to interfere in his concerns. So he regretted that he could not befriend his poor weather-beaten ambassador.

Once more Schlitte was in difficulties. In 1555 he wrote to the Tsar for money, on the plea presumably that he was still busy hunting up the professors who had met such scant courtesy at the hands of the Lübeckians. The same year he applied for a remittance to the Diet of Augsburg ; but he was well known there, and he met with a rebuff. He was at last fallen on evil days, his game was played out ; but he played it in finished style while it lasted. Two years later he reached Moscow, and not unlikely under the greatest difficulties. To the traveller, Moscow was then as far as Kamschatka is now. When he reached home after all his adventures he set himself to work to exploit the Tsar in a quiet way. Our readers will remember that Charles V. wrote to Ivan in 1558 to compliment him on the great efforts he was making for the civilization of the fast-growing Slav kingdom, of which Moscow was the centre. Schlitte could not brook the idea of being idle, and leaving his master's correspondence in arrears. So he writes an answer himself in the name of Ivan IV. As his chancellor has written copious despatches and instructions to kings, cardinals, and the Pope, there could not be much incongruity in the master of that same chancellor writing an answer from the Tsar to the Emperor. The utmost

indifference with which Schlitte dashes off enormous items of information, and elaborates a go-ahead policy of magnificent dimensions, conveys the impression of doing business on a scale of unparalleled grandeur. He shapes his answer on the following lines:—The Tsar is quite ready to disburse large sums of money for the war against the Turks (Charles V.'s idea exactly); to send an ambassador to the Court of the Holy Empire (Charles V.'s idea again); to start a postal service between Moscow and Augsburg; to create a German regiment and an order of knights; and to seal all this grand union of the Catholic Church by an exchange of hostages—the Tsar to send twenty-five youths of the best Russian families to Charles. As for the union of the Churches, it is a mere trifle, and the Tsar is thirsting for it. He need not go into *minutiae* in his letter; it is a matter of theological subtleties, which can be best left to the Doctors of Divinity, who will be able to adjust the matter to everybody's satisfaction straightaway. When the aforesaid *doctores graves* come to Moscow there will be no delay in settling the question; and in the meantime the grand old glorious idea of a universal Catholic Republic, girding Europe with its armies, is secured.

He once more fired the imagination of his earlier years—an effort fully worthy of the 1548 diplomacy; but it was his last. Charles V. never saw the letter, for it was never sent; and we need not say Ivan never saw it. It was Schlitte's last forgery and his last fraud. He disappears for evermore as quietly as his chancellor. History is silent as to when he died, and we need not concern ourselves about it.

Such is this man's history—daring, unscrupulous, a liar, a forger, at once a Catholic, a schismatic, a heretic; planning to-day a campaign against the Turks with an emperor, and an alliance with them with a king; converting Russia to Catholicism with Charles V., and to Protestantism with Christian III.; he was never at a loss for a plausible tale to give colour to the dignity which he assumed, and to the office which he conferred on his chancellor. He deceived everybody he wanted to deceive, whenever and wherever it suited

his purpose. Kings, emperors, popes, or cardinals—at Copenhagen or in the Holy Empire, in Vienna or in Rome, Schlitte was always Schlitte—always planning, plotting, scheming, and making provision for getting out of any given difficulty in half-a-dozen ways. It was nothing to Schlitte that he was betraying and stultifying the most sacred authority on earth, or that he was seeking paltry political advantages by daring forgeries, which would one day or another give him his proper place in history; and all that in the name of a man whose horrors and crimes are to this day remembered in Russia. Nothing seems so well calculated to give us an idea of the man's utter daring as to recall the master in whose name he planned his selfish schemes before the eyes of western Europe for six years. Ivan IV., son of Vasili, was born in 1530. He succeeded to the family tradition of autocracy in its most absolute sense. He claimed neither regal honours from the Pope nor royal status from the boiars (*optimates*). He was his father's son, and inherited his father's thoroughness both of mind and body.

“Russorum rex et Dominus sum; jure paterni
Sanguinis: imperii titulus a nemine, quavis
Mercatus prece, vel precio: nec legibus ullis
Subditus alterius, sed Christo credulus uni
Emendicatos aliis aspernor honores.”

So sang his father in questionable poetry, but unquestionable prose. Ivan Vasilievich, surnamed the Terrible, strained this absolutism to indulge in every crime. He was the Russian Nero, with a blend of Henry VIII. He had seven wives, and thus beat the English king's record. He instituted a body-guard (*oprichniks*), who were the blood-letters of their blood-thirsty master. During his reign blood flowed in Russia. He never spared an enemy, even a suspected one; and an act of clemency was not ever extended to friend or foe whenever Ivan was thirsting for more blood. He butchered members of his own family, and then prayed to the saints for forgiveness. He Russianized the Russian Church, tore it further away from the Catholic Church than any of his

predecessors ; and all this time Schlitte was representing him in the West as a mild lamb ruling his people with his own sweet authority, sighing for the reunion of Christendom, and, like another St. Ignatius in the North, living for nothing but the glory of God and the welfare of the Christian Commonwealth !

Schlitte's daring, however, was not far in excess of the absurdly ridiculous degree of credulity which at all times his dupes manifested. Steinberg's procedure was highly suspicious. That a bogus chancellor could be created by a penniless man just escaped from prison, at a time when the ways of Russian diplomacy were well-known, is very remarkable ; but that the Roman Commission should acquiesce in the aforesaid " chancellor's " remarkable methods and plans, argues an amount of sweet, childlike innocence and lovable blandness which well-read people hardly expect to find in that quarter. Three ranks of Russian diplomats were well known, and the Schlitte-cum-Steinberg combination fell into line with none of them ; and still Rome remained to the end full of confidence, until at length the bubble was pricked, and the humouring of the Vatican came to nought, as such schemes ever will.

Here we leave Hans Schlitte of Goslar. He was a man of talent and ingenuity, but not of that kind which history will applaud, although it will appreciate it. We are satisfied if we have placed his claims for remembrance before our readers, as one of the adventurers of the past, who, in an hour of trouble for the Church, sought vulgar gains at the expense of the Vicar of Christ.

JOSEPH TYNAN.

Theological Questions.

MAY A PRIEST WHO ASKS ANOTHER TO SAY MASS FOR WHICH
A HONORARIUM WAS GIVEN, RETAIN FOR HIMSELF A PART
OF THE HONORARIUM ?

“ REV. DEAR SIR,

“ Please inform me in the pages of the I. E. RECORD what I am bound to do under the following circumstances :—

“ For the past ten years I have been pastor of a church with two assistants. The fee for a solemn requiem mass in my parish is twenty-five dollars. When I celebrated I gave the deacon, sub-deacon, and organist (the choir is a voluntary one), two and a-half dollars each, and kept the balance, seventeen and one-half dollars, for myself. If, however, from any cause, I was unable to celebrate, one of my assistants celebrated, and the fee was divided as follows :—celebrant, ten dollars ; deacon, sub-deacon, and organist, two and one-half dollars each, leaving me a balance of seven and one-half dollars in case I did not officiate at all, and ten dollars when, as sometimes it happened, I acted either as deacon or sub-deacon.

“ The fee for a high mass of requiem, without deacon or sub-deacon, is fifteen dollars. Of this two and one-half dollars went to the organist. When I celebrated, I kept the balance. If one of my assistants celebrated, I gave him ten dollars, keeping two and one-half dollars for myself, even when I had nothing to do with the mass.

“ On All Souls’ Day the faithful make an offering for a requiem mass, amounting sometimes to one hundred dollars. When I celebrated, I kept the whole amount, less two and one-half dollars each for deacon, sub-deacon, and organist. On one or two occasions I was unable to celebrate myself, but gave an assistant ten dollars for doing so.

“ Have I done wrong in any or all of these cases ? If so, am I bound to make restitution ? to whom ? and to what extent ?

“ PASTOR.”

1. Our correspondent’s questions require us to examine one of the celebrated Declarations or Decrees *de celebratione Missarum* of the Sacred Congregation of the Council,

published in the year 1625, by order of Urban VIII., and republished and confirmed by Innocent XII., in the year 1697: "Omne damnabile lucrum ab Ecclesia remove volens [Pontifex] prohibet sacerdoti qui Missam suscipit celebrandam cum certa eleemosyna, ne eandem missam alteri, parte ejusdem eleemosynae sibi retenta, celebrandam committat." We shall now consider the extent of this prohibition in a general way; its bearing on masses both *perpetual* and *manual*; and in particular its application to the questions proposed by our correspondent.

2. We may say, generally, that it is not lawful for a priest who has got a *honorarium* for a mass, and who appoints another priest to say the mass, to retain for himself a part of the *honorarium*, unless there was at the beginning some extrinsic title for the acceptance of the *honorarium*—some title distinct from, and extrinsic to the celebration of mass itself. It is of importance, therefore, to consider when a *honorarium* is supposed to be given from other motives than the celebration of mass alone.

3. Masses are of two kinds—*perpetual* and *manual*, or *adventitious*: "Nemo ignorat perpetuas alias, alias vero adventitias Missas nuncupari. Primae quidem quotidie vel certis quibusdam diebus ratione Beneficii, aut Fundatoris instituto, vel Testatoris voluntate celebrantur. Adventitiae vocantur pro quibus stipendium a Fidelibus traditur, ita tamen ut nullus fundus, nullumque onus in futurum tempus constituatur." (Bened. XIV., *Inst. Eccl.*, L. vi., n. 10.) The Decree of the Sacred Congregation referred to does not affect *perpetual* masses, but only *manual* masses; because in the case of *perpetual* masses there is always some extrinsic title for the acceptance of the *honoraria*. Hence:

I. If a parish priest got a substitute to offer mass for his people on a Sunday, he is not bound to give him a *pro rata* of his whole income, though his income from the parish is his own *honorarium* for the *Missa pro populo*. The reason is, because a parish priest's income is not given exclusively as a *honorarium* for the mass which he offers for his parishioners on Sundays and holidays. *Habetur titulus, extrinsecus*, "1° quando agitur de Missis parochiali prae-

bendae, Beneficiis, aut Capellaniis inhaerentibus ; quia Parochi, beneficiati, Capellani non debent pro celebratione harum Missarum dare stipendium quod fructibus praebendae respondeat, sed manuale ; cum hos fructus non solo titulo celebrationis suos facient." (Varceno, vol. ii., page 82.)

II. The same is true of masses that are literally *perpetual*. *Habetur titulus extrinsecus*, "2^o quando agitur de Missis perpetuis alicui Sacerdoti demandatis. Nam hic aliud onus suscipit ab ipsa celebratione distinctum, quod . . . est pretio aestimabile." (*Idem*.)

4. We come now to consider *manual masses*. *Manual honoraria* may be taken in a strict sense to mean offerings given exclusively for the celebration of mass ; and when such a *honorarium* is received, it is not lawful when deputing another to say the mass, to retain any part of the *honorarium* ; except when the priest who is to say the mass, spontaneously and *unasked*, offers to say it for a smaller *honorarium*. "Ergo concluditur e contrario . . . 2. Si alter sacerdos, cui Missa dicenda committitur, *non rogatus* libere omnino partem aliquam cedit, si quidem id pro puro dono tum habetur." (Lehmkuhl, tom. ii., page 150, n. 204.)

5. Finally, there are *manual honoraria* which are not given exclusively for the celebration of masses ; but are given primarily as a legacy ; or *intuitu personae* ; or constitute an honorary part of the priest's income to whom they are given ; or belong to what are called *jura stolae*. In these cases a priest may appoint another to say the mass or masses required, and retain for himself a part of the *honorarium*.

I. *Habetur titulus extrinsecus*, "Quando legatum alicui relinquitur cum onere Missarum ; nam legatum habet rationem donationis et semper causam lucrativam continet." (Varceno, *ibid*.)

This, however, is true only when the legacy is primarily intended, and the obligation of having masses celebrated is attached to the legacy. But if the testator primarily intended to leave money for masses, and appointed an executor rather than a legatee strictly so called, the masses should be regarded as *manual masses in the strict sense*.

II. *Habetur titulus extrinsecus*, "Quando in Missis adventitiis sive lectis sive cantatis eleemosyna pinguior consueta conceditur *intuitu personae*, scil. propter ipsius dignitatem vel officium, &c." (*Ibid.*)

III. "Quando eleemosynae Missarum adventitiarum extraordinariae Parochi congruam efformant." (*Ibid.*) Hence in Ireland, wherever the custom exists of saying only one mass or a few masses for the *honoraria* received on the second of November, if a parish priest or a curate appointed a delegate to say these masses, he would not be bound to give him all the offerings, but only the usual manual stipend. Because these offerings partake of the nature of parochial dues; and, therefore, are not given exclusively for the celebration of masses.

IV. "Quando agitur de Missis adventitiis quae pertinent ad Parochum *ex juribus stolae*, quae sunt Missae nuptiales, et Missae exequiales, quarum celebratio de jure et consuetudine ad Parochos spectat." (*Ibid.*)

6. It is easy to apply these principles to the questions proposed by our correspondent. The masses to which he refers were not perpetual masses; neither were they what we have called *manual masses in the strict sense of the word*; the *honoraria* given for these masses were not given exclusively for the celebration of the masses; but were either a portion of the Pastor's income—as, for example, the November offerings—or belonged to what are called the *jura stolae*. Therefore, we conclude that our correspondent in appointing a substitute, was not bound to give him the whole of the stipend which he himself had received; that he was not wrong in any of the cases mentioned, unless there was some violation of local ecclesiastical law; and that he is not bound to make any restitution.

7. Finally, we would refer our readers for a full treatment of this question to Varceno, whom we have quoted at great length; Lehmkuhl, Konings, and the *Acta S. Sedis*, vol viii. And we have in conclusion to express our sincere regret to our correspondent for having, through pressure of other duties, delayed for too long a time an answer to his questions.

D. COGHLAN.

Liturgical Questions.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.—I.

In the beginning of our missals and breviaries we find several pages of elaborately constructed tables. Some of these tables are called *Paschal* or *Easter Tables*; the others, *Tables of the Movable Feasts*. The former are perpetual; that is, they give the date of Easter, and consequently of the feasts connected with Easter, for all past and future time. The latter tables are only temporary, and give the dates of the movable feasts, of course including Easter, for a longer or shorter period according to the size of the page and the quality of the type employed. But even a single glance at these two sets of tables will reveal a very marked difference between them. And if after a glance one were asked wherein this difference consists, he would, no doubt, reply, that one set appears intelligible, the other utterly unintelligible. The *Easter Tables* at first and for a considerable time present nothing but a perplexing puzzle apparently impossible of solution; while the *Tables of Movable Feasts*, so far as pointing out the dates of these feasts on the years included in the tables, present no kind of difficulty whatsoever. The real and objective difference, however, between the two sets of tables is, that the *Easter Tables* are the formulæ from which by a process of calculation the others are constructed: the former are the seed; the latter, the well-proportioned tree, reared from the seed by the skill and care of the gardener. And just as no one but a skilled botanist can tell what species of tree a particular seedling should produce, while anyone seeing the tree can at once tell to what species it belongs; so, while from the latter tables the most inexperienced can find the date of Easter, and of all its train of feasts, only experts can with absolute certainty use the former tables for this purpose.

Though so different, these two sets of tables have still something in common. But this something is not, unfortunately, a ray of light borrowed by the obscure set from its

more luminous neighbour: on the contrary, it is a dark cloud received from the former into the bosom of the latter, and requiring to be penetrated by him who would fully understand these latter, or the principle on which they are constructed. And this cloud is lined with triple darkness; or, to drop metaphor, there are three things, each involving considerable difficulty, which we must understand before we can fully understand even the easier set of tables, and an intimate knowledge of which is absolutely necessary to enable us to employ the more difficult set. These three things are the *Golden Number*, the *Dominical Letter*, and the *Epacts*—titles which we see at the head of as many parallel columns on the page devoted to the *Old Paschal Tables*, still printed in our missals and breviaries, as well as on the page or pages devoted to the *Tables of Movable Feasts*. In the *New Easter Tables*, compiled by Lilius and Clavius at the time of the reform of the calendar by Gregory XIII., the *Golden Number* is dispensed with, and only the *Dominical Letter* and the *Epacts* are employed. The omission of the *Golden Number* in the new tables is due, as we shall see, to the extension and to the extended use of the cycle of *Epacts*; but even in these tables it can still be usefully employed in conjunction with the other two elements. But more of this afterwards. At present let us pause for a moment, and look back over the ages that are past, that we may learn in what esteem for many centuries was held the now neglected, if not despised, knowledge of how to compile the calendar of movable feasts, or of the *computus ecclesiasticus*, as it was then called.

It sounds like exaggeration to say that this knowledge was once considered indispensable in candidates for the priesthood. And yet in reality this statement does not convey a fair idea of the vast importance of old attached to this knowledge. Without it priests were unworthy of their sacred title.¹ All aspirants to the priesthood were to be early and fully imbued with it, and bishops in testing the

¹“Sacerdotes computum scire tenentur, alioquin vix eis nomen sacerdotis constabit.” Durandus, *Rat. div. offici.*, l. viii., c. 9. Cf. *Decret. Gratiani*, c. v. dist. 38.

acquirements of their priests, and of young men presenting themselves for Holy Orders, were wont to insist as strongly on this knowledge as on a knowledge of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed.¹ Even the Council of Trent mentions the *computus* as one of the subjects which should be diligently taught in ecclesiastical seminaries.² And still later, Benedict XIII., speaking of the education and training of ecclesiastical students, insists in the most solemn manner on the exact observance of this decree of the Council of Trent, the very words of which he makes his own.³

This knowledge, declared by popes and councils, by bishops and canonists, to be so essential for ecclesiastics, was almost equally necessary for laymen having any pretensions to a liberal education. As the ecclesiastical authorities required it in those who would attain to the dignity of the priesthood, so did the universities require it in all who sought degrees or distinctions in their halls.⁴

These facts, to which many others of a similar kind could easily be added, offer a sufficient apology for the present essay, especially as that knowledge, once so highly prized, is now possessed by very few even among ecclesiastics. But, apart altogether from the importance formerly attached to the computing of the calendar, the subject possesses an intrinsic interest, which must attract anyone who takes the trouble to look into it. So, at least, it has for a long time appeared to the present writer, who may say, with Cardinal Newman in one of the opening sentences of an essay on the *Ordo de Tempore*—a subject, by the way, closely related to ours—"I sometimes fancy I could interest a reader in it, and I will try."

It has been hinted already that the methods by which

¹ Ludovicus Cellotius vere dixit episcopos notitiam computi ecclesiastici presbyteris et cleris pene non minus necessariam censuisse quam orationem dominicam et symbolum. *Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques*, tom 9, p. 17.

² Pueri in seminariis recepti, computi ecclesiastici aliarumque bonarum artium disciplinam discent. *Sess. 23, c. 17, de Refor.*

³ Constitut. *Creditae nobis*. May 9, 1725.

⁴ Baccalarii nostrae facultatis disputent, legant gratis et propter Deum *computos* et alia mathematicalia praecipue tamen Ecclesiae Catholicae deservientia." *Old Statutes of the University of Vienna*, tit. xii.

the calendar of movable feasts is computed are at first somewhat difficult to understand. But if we dissect them, and examine the different parts separately and in order, the difficulties will disappear, or rather they will not appear at all. Following the natural order, we must begin by learning what the ecclesiastical calendar itself is; for obviously a knowledge of what it is should precede a knowledge of how it is computed. Now, this investigation opens up the whole question of the origin and history of the calendar; of the time at which it was first formed; and of the changes subsequently introduced. And as the ecclesiastical calendar is founded on the civil, and is, indeed, almost identical with it, we must begin our investigations with the latter.

The civil calendar is derived from the Romans, whose traditions point to Romulus, the founder of their city, as the founder of their calendar also. According to the best authorities,¹ the year of Romulus consisted of 304 days, divided into ten months. Of these months, four had thirty-one days each, the remaining six thirty each. The first month was March, which accounts for the now inappropriate and apparently meaningless names of the four last months of our year—*September, October, November, December*. The fifth and sixth months, our July and August, were named *Quintilis* and *Sextilis*, on the same principle.

But a period of three hundred and four days, not being in agreement with either the sun or the moon, could not long be retained as a fixed unit of time. Accordingly we find the first reform of the calendar attributed to Numa,² the successor of Romulus, who is said to have introduced the lunar year, consisting of twelve lunations or lunar months. And since a lunar month corresponds very nearly with twenty-nine and a-half days,³ the year of Numa should have had

¹ Petavius, *De Doct. Temporum*, l. ii., c. 74. Neibuhr, *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i.; p. 275, English trans., London, 1847. Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. Art. "Calendar." Niebuhr points out that the year of Romulus contained exactly thirty-eight Etruscan weeks of eight days, and that six such years are practically equal in length to five solar years of three hundred and sixty-five days, the ancient *lustrum*.

² *Ibidem*.

³ A lunation, or the interval from new moon to new moon, is exactly 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 2·87 seconds.

only three hundred and fifty-four days. But three hundred and fifty-four is an even number, and even numbers were regarded by the superstitious Romans as in the last degree unlucky. In order, therefore, to propitiate the adverse Fates, one day was added, thus giving the year three hundred and fifty-five days. To the same superstition still another sacrifice was made. Six of the months, as we have seen, had thirty days each. From each of these was taken one day, so that the ten original months were all made up of an odd number of days, namely, thirty-one and twenty-nine. And the six days thus deducted being joined to the fifty-one already added to the year of Romulus, the whole was divided between two months, to one of which were given twenty-nine, to the other twenty-eight days. The new months were called *Januarius* and *Februarius*, the latter being placed at the end, the former at the beginning of the year, in which order they remained until 452 B.C., when, by a decree of the Decemvirs, February was made to follow January as the second month of the year.

But Numa's task was not yet complete. He had, it is true, brought the year into harmony with the moon. But as the seasons are regulated by the solar, and not by the lunar year, some scheme had to be devised whereby the latter might be made to coincide with the former. It would seem that even so early as the time of Numa, the Romans, afterwards so conspicuous for their ignorance of astronomy, were aware that their civil year of three hundred and fifty-five days was shorter by ten or eleven days than the natural or solar year. Accordingly it was ordered by Numa that a thirteenth month should be introduced into every second year. This month, called *Mercedonius*, was to consist alternately of twenty-two and twenty-three days, and was to be introduced between the 23rd and 24th of February. By this arrangement ninety intercalary days were added to each period of eight civil years, making in all two thousand nine hundred and thirty days. But eight solar years of three hundred and sixty-five and a-quarter days contain only two thousand nine hundred and twenty-two. Hence, neglecting the inaccuracy of making the solar year equal

to three hundred and sixty-five and a-quarter days, each year was now on an average one day too long. To remedy this it was determined that in every third period of eight years, instead of inserting four months having twenty-two and twenty-three days alternately, only three should be inserted, each consisting of no more than twenty-two days. This expedient restored complete harmony after each cycle of twenty-four years.

But devices so clumsy, as these undoubtedly were, could not be employed for any length of time without error and consequent confusion. To obviate this as far as possible, it was at length resolved to hand over the entire control of the calendar to the Pontiffs, who, it was thought, would concern themselves to have the various feasts of the year celebrated on the correct days according to the calendar. But the Pontiffs did nothing of the sort. Instead, they prostituted their power of intercalating to the most venal and most disgraceful of uses. They lengthened or shortened a year according as they wished to keep a friend in office or turn out an enemy, to ruin a creditor or crush a debtor. And so little care did they take even then to keep the civil and solar years in harmony, that at the time of Julius Cæsar the equinoxes were actually three months removed from their proper places.

This disgraceful disorder in so important an element of social, political, and religious life, as the calendar, Cæsar determined to remove. The problem to be solved was two-fold. The error which had been permitted to creep into the calendar was to be corrected, and some method was to be devised whereby the recurrence of a similar error should be effectually prevented. Cæsar's position as *Pontifex Maximus* empowered him to correct the error of the past by adding to any year as many days as would suffice to restore the equinoxes to the place they originally held in the time of Numa, namely, March 25. By the aid, chiefly of Sosigenes, a Greek astronomer, a scheme was devised by which it was hoped all future confusion would be avoided.

The year to which the necessary number of days was added was 46 B.C. (708 U.C.). It was found that the 1st of

January of that year occurred ninety entire days before the proper time; or, in other words, that the 1st of January, 46 B.C., was in reality the last day of September, 47 B.C.¹ The ordinary intercalary month of twenty-three days, which was due to this year was inserted as usual in February, thus reducing the difference between the civil and the natural calendar to sixty-seven days; and these days, divided into two extraordinary months of thirty-three and thirty-four days, were inserted between November and December. The year 46 B.C. consisted, therefore, of the extraordinary number of four hundred and forty-five days, and has been on this account called by many contemporary and subsequent writers "The year of Confusion." The title given to it by Macrobius, "The last year of Confusion," is much more just.

In this manner Cæsar succeeded in making the 25th of March, 45 B.C. (709 U.C.), coincide with the vernal equinox; and, consequently, in making the 1st of January of the civil year coincide with the first of January of the solar year. To preserve this coincidence he decreed that the common year in future should consist of three hundred and sixty-five days instead of three hundred and fifty-five, and that every fourth year an additional day should be added to the month of February. This day, like the intercalary month of the old calendar, was inserted between the 23rd and 24th of February. In the mode of reckoning the days of the month employed by the Romans, the 24th of February was called *sexto-calendas Martias*; and in order not to change the denomination of the succeeding days of February, on account of the intercalary day, it was decided to call this day by the same name as the 24th. Hence in every fourth year there were two *sexto-calendas Martias*; and these years were consequently called *bissextile years*.

The three hundred and sixty-five days of which the year was now composed were redistributed by Cæsar among the twelve months. The odd months, beginning with January, were to have thirty-one days each; the even months, thirty;

¹ Before the Julian reform, November and December had only twenty-nine days each.

except February, which in common years was to have only twenty-nine, and in bissextile years thirty. This sensible and easily remembered distribution was disturbed for a very frivolous reason. To commemorate Cæsar's action in reforming the calendar, the old title of the month *Quintilis* had been changed to *Julius*. The Emperor Augustus, unwilling that any honour should be paid to another that was not also accorded to himself, had the name of the month *Sextilis* changed into *Augustus*. But, according to the existing distribution of the days among the months, Cæsar's month had thirty-one days, while that to which the name of Augustus was given had only thirty. The pride of Augustus revolted at this; he insisted that his month should have as many days as his rival's; and to satisfy him one day was taken from February and added to August, thus leaving to February only twenty-eight days in common years, and twenty-nine in bissextile.

But the Julian calendar, though a great improvement on that of Numa, which preceded it, was not perfect. It was founded on the hypothesis that the solar year contains exactly three hundred and sixty-five and a-quarter days, or three hundred and sixty-five days six hours. But this hypothesis gives to the solar year a little over eleven minutes too much, the exact length of the year being three hundred and sixty-five days, five hours, forty-eight minutes, fifty seconds. Cæsar and his advisers seem to have been aware, if not of the exact amount of the excess of their year over the true solar year, at least that there was an excess. It is to be presumed, however, that they considered the excess so trifling that it might be altogether neglected. But even a very trifling error in each year, when allowed to accumulate for centuries, must make its presence felt. Eleven minutes a year is equivalent to an entire day in about one hundred and thirty years. Hence the Julian year being too long by about this amount, the equinoxes receded from the date on which they were fixed by Cæsar at the rate of one day in one hundred and thirty years. Thus it happened that the vernal equinox with which Cæsar made the 25th of March to coincide, fell on or about the 21st of March, at the time

of the Council of Nice, celebrated in 325 A.D. And although this council, in determining the date at which Easter should be celebrated, made the vernal equinox an essential factor, and fixed the 21st of March as the date at which this phenomenon then occurred, no notice whatever was taken of the error involved in the Julian calendar. In course of time the vernal equinox, which had before receded from the 25th to the 21st March, receded also from the 21st; and, consequently, the rule laid down by the Council of Nice for determining the date of Easter became more and more erroneous as the centuries went on. For it must be borne in mind that those who computed the Easter time were guided, not by the actual position of the sun in the heavens, but by the dates which were supposed to coincide with certain solar phenomena.

To this ever-increasing separation between the equinoxes and their dates, as defined by the Nicene Fathers, attention was frequently called from the eighth to the sixteenth century. In the thirteenth century Roger Bacon proposed a simple and practical method of removing the error and of preventing it afterwards, and urged Pope Clement IV. to use his influence to have it adopted. Sixtus IV., towards the end of the fifteenth century, moved by the representations made to himself and to several of his predecessors, invited Regiomontanus to Rome to undertake the work of bringing the calendar into harmony with the course of the sun. But the sudden and premature death of this celebrated astronomer put an end for a time to the hopes excited by the action of the Supreme Pontiff.

After the lapse of another century Pope Gregory XIII. definitely took in hand the work of reforming the calendar. Now, as when the Julian reform was introduced, two things had to be done. The accumulated error of past centuries had to be removed, and some effective means had to be found for preventing the recurrence of a similar error. At this time the civil calendar was ten whole days in advance of the sun. Consequently the vernal equinox, so important a factor in the ecclesiastical calendar, fell on the 11th instead of the 21st of March. The first problem, then, which had to

be solved was to drop ten days out of the year, so as to restore the vernal equinox to the day fixed by the Council of Nice. The second problem was to devise a simple and workable means of dropping three days out of every four centuries of the Julian calendar. For three days in four centuries is about equivalent to one day in one hundred and thirty years ; and this, as we have seen, was about the excess of the Julian year over the true solar year.

Pope Gregory, by a circular addressed, in 1577, to Catholic princes, and to the Catholic universities throughout the world, asked the co-operation of the learned. Along with this letter he submitted a scheme for reforming the calendar drawn up by Aloysius Lilius, an Italian physician, celebrated for his knowledge of mathematics ; and the Pontiff requested that whoever thought he could improve on this scheme should at once forward his alternative scheme, while those whom the scheme satisfied should signify their assent. The result was that the scheme proposed by Lilius was adopted. But Lilius had died even before his scheme was submitted to Gregory, and some one had, therefore, to be found to elaborate, explain, and defend the methods and tables required by the scheme. The choice fell on Father Clavius, a learned member of the Society of Jesus, whose work, *Kalendarium Gregorianum Perpetuum*, containing a full and clear exposition of all the changes introduced by the new calendar, was published towards the end of the year, in the beginning of which the calendar itself was published.

This year was 1582. On the 24th of February, Gregory XIII. issued the Bull, *Inter gravissimas*, in which the adoption of the new calendar was ordered, a general explanation of it given, and a fuller explanation promised to follow in a short time. This promise referred to the work of Clavius just mentioned. The Pope disposed of the ten days by which the calendar had outstripped the sun from the time of the first Council of Nice, by ordering ten nominal days to be dropped out of the month of October, 1582. The day after the Feast of St. Francis, which falls on the 4th of October, was in that year to be called, not the 5th, but the 15th.

Hence the 21st December, 1582, became the 31st December, 1582; and, consequently, the 22nd December, 1582, became the 1st January, 1583; and the 11th March, 1583, became the 21st March, 1583. Thus then was the date on which it fell at the time of the Council of Nice restored to the vernal equinox, and thus was solved the first of the two problems involved in the reformation of the calendar.

The remaining problem, as we have seen, was to permanently secure to the vernal equinox the possession of this date. And here is how this problem, too, was solved. The Julian calendar, as has been shown, made the year too long by something over eleven minutes, so that in about one hundred and thirty years the calendar would be an entire day in advance of the sun. Hence, had nothing been done by Gregory to correct this error the vernal equinox would have got back to the 20th of March about the year 1712, to the 19th about 1840, and to the 18th about 1970. To prevent this it was decreed that the years 1700, 1800, and 1900, though leap-years, according to the Julian calendar, should be only common years of three hundred and sixty-five days in the new calendar. By this means the four centuries from 1600 to 2000 are shorter by three days in the Gregorian than they would be in the Julian calendar, and three days in four centuries is, as we have seen, as nearly as possible the proportion in which the average Julian year exceeded the true solar year. Briefly, then, and in general, the method adopted in the Gregorian calendar to correct the error of the Julian, is to make the century years, or the last year of each century, which in the Julian calendar would have three hundred and sixty-six days, common years of only three hundred and sixty-five days, unless when they are divisible by four hundred. The century years, which are also leap-years, are, consequently, 1600, 2000, 2400, 2800, &c.

The new calendar at once became law in the states over which the temporal sovereignty of the Pope extended, as well as in Spain and Portugal. Hence, in these countries, the new style dates from October 4th, 1582, exclusive. In France the change was adopted and sanctioned

by law in the same year, and was introduced by calling the 10th December, 1582, the 20th. The Catholic States of Germany adopted it in 1584, Poland in 1586, and Hungary in 1587. But Protestant States for a long time refused to receive the new calendar because it came from the Pope. "We cannot"—to quote one of their writers—"We cannot receive anything from the Pope, who is Antichrist, without incurring the risk of falling under his yoke." But at length, in 1700, they did receive it, and as the error in the Julian calendar was then one day more than at the first introduction of the Gregorian reform, they dropped eleven nominal days out of the month of September. In England upwards of fifty years were still necessary to reconcile the descendants of the Covenanters and Roundheads to this invention of the "Scarlet Woman." "The anti-papal spirit," says an impartial writer, "being much more dominant in England than common sense or scientific authority, the reform was resisted for nearly two centuries, so that the real had fallen above eleven days behind the legal date of the equinox. In 1752, however, the force of things prevailed over this discreditable bigotry, and the reform was introduced into the calendar, by declaring the 3rd to be the 14th of September." In Russia the Julian calendar is still retained, and consequently Russian dates are now twelve days behind the corresponding dates in other Christian countries. Thus, for example, this day, which with us is October 7, is in Russia September 25.

The Gregorian calendar is called *New Style*, in contradistinction to the Julian, which is called *Old Style*. For some years after the introduction of the new style into England, it was customary to give in printed books the dates of events both in the new and the old style. Thus, for example, the day which was the 20th May, 1760, in the new style, being the 9th May, 1760, in the old, the date was printed thus, $\frac{9}{20}$ May, 1760. And when the change of style involved a change from one month to another, the date was printed in this manner $\frac{\text{May } 27}{\text{June } 7}$, 1760, the numerator of the

fraction giving always old style, and the denominator new style.

But new style, as understood in England, implies a further change besides that occasioned by dropping eleven days to bring the civil calendar into agreement with the sun. Up till 1752, the year in England began on Lady Day, otherwise called the Feast of the Annunciation, which falls on March 25; so that March 24, 1750, was the last day of the year 1750, and the day which immediately followed it was March 25, 1751, and the first day of that year. Parliament, in resolving to adopt the Gregorian reform, resolved, also, to date the beginning of the year from the 1st of January. Consequently the civil year, 1751, which began on March 25, was deprived of the entire months of January and February, and of 24 days of March, and made to end on December 31. Hence the new style changed dates not only from one month to another, but also from one year to another. For example, January 25th, 1753, old style, became February 5, 1754, new style, and was printed

January 25, 1753
February 5, 1754;

and January 1, 1753, old style, became January 12, 1754, new style, and was printed as the foregoing.

Traces of the change of style, and of the alterations in the date at which the year begins, are still to be found in various practices, and in the appellations of various days. Thus, among the people, the expression, "Old May-Day," "Old Hallows'-Day," or "Old Hallow-Day," as it is generally pronounced, are very commonly used to designate the 12th May and the 12th November, the dates in the new style corresponding with the 1st May and the 1st November, respectively, in the old. And these two dates (the 12th May and the 12th November), moreover, are in many localities, the "terms" or dates for entering into and dissolving contracts.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT IN CONVENT CHAPELS DURING
THE "TRIDUUM" OF HOLY WEEK.

"I. Is it permissible to reserve the Blessed Sacrament in convent chapels which enjoy the privilege of reservation throughout the year, during the *Triduum* of Holy Week, whether mass be celebrated in the chapel on Holy Thursday or not? I have heard of a priest being required by the head priest of the church from which the convent was served to consume all particles remaining in the ciborium at mass on Holy Thursday. Of course, I exclude the case where it might be necessary to reserve for the sick, on account of great distance from a public church."

THE USE OF A FORM FOR IMPARTING A PLENARY
INDULGENCE.

"II. In our faculties in this country (England) we receive power, 'Indulgentiam plenariam concedendi primo conversis ab haeresi,' but no mention is made of any formula to be used on such occasions.

"The late Dr. Grant in one of his instructions to the clergy suggests the use of the formula approved by Benedict XIV., for granting the Plenary Indulgence in the hour of death.

"Can you tell me if any formula is required; or is the Indulgence gained *ipso facto*, on admission to the Church, provided the priest has the faculty of granting it?—" Yours faithfully,
"W. J. B."

I. The difficulty raised by our esteemed correspondent in his first question is quite new to us, as it will be, we imagine, to most of our readers. The rubrics of the Missal with reference to those things which may or may not be done in churches, chapels, and oratories during the last three days of Holy Week are very explicit, and these rubrics have been confirmed, explained, and amplified by a large number of *resolutions* of the Congregation of Rites, and by Pontifical decrees as well; but, so far as we can make out, the liceity of preserving the Blessed Sacrament during those days in chapels or oratories where it is customary to preserve it at other times, has never been questioned. Private masses are forbidden, with certain exceptions, on Thursday and Saturday of Holy Week, and absolutely on Good Friday; the

ceremonies of this *Triduum* must be carried out either solemnly, or according to the method approved of by Benedict XIII. ; there are even certain chapels and oratories in which it is forbidden to employ this latter method ; and finally, it is unlawful to preserve the Blessed Sacrament during these days in chapels or oratories where it is not usually preserved. Yet, notwithstanding these minute details concerning the ceremonies and the custody of the Blessed Sacrament, which we find in liturgical works, not a word do we find from which it could be inferred that the Blessed Sacrament is to be removed on Holy Thursday from the church, chapel, or oratory in which the ceremonies of Holy Week cannot be, or are not carried out. We are, therefore, justified in inferring the contrary, and in stating generally that it is lawful to preserve the Blessed Sacrament during the *Triduum* of Holy Week in all places where it is lawfully preserved at other times.

II. Not having had an opportunity of seeing a copy of the faculties granted to priests in England, we experience some diffidence in replying to our correspondent's second question. We will, however, state what we think should hold generally in cases of this kind.

First, then, it would appear that some form must be used ; that, consequently, the *neo-conversus*, by the mere reception into the Church does not gain the indulgence. For if this were the case, reception or admission into the Church would be the *condition* for gaining the indulgence, and the indulgence would be attached to the fulfilment of this condition, as other indulgences are attached to the fulfilment of the conditions prescribed for gaining them. But in the case before us it appears that the indulgence is not attached to the performance of what is necessary for reception into the Church as to a condition ; but that, on the contrary, the priest who receives the person into the Church is empowered to grant the indulgence. And manifestly, in order to do this, he must signify in some intelligible manner his intention of doing it. In other words, he must use some form of words which will of themselves express the nature of the favour conferred.

What has just been said may be illustrated and confirmed from what is prescribed in the case of granting a dispensation in an impediment of marriage. When the dispensation is granted *in forma commissoria*—the usual form—the confessor of the person asking for the dispensation is generally made the channel through which the dispensation is conveyed. And the dispensation does not take effect until he has communicated it by some form of words to his penitent. He is free to use a Latin form, such as may be found in theological treatises, or he may express the same thing in the vernacular.¹ But express it he must in some form; otherwise the dispensation is not granted at all, in the formal sense.

Some form, therefore, must be used; and since there is no special form prescribed, we are of opinion that, apart from local legislation, no special form is necessary; and, therefore, that a priest, having the requisite faculties, can impart the indulgence in any form expressive of the act he performs; just as, in the example cited, the confessor can impart the dispensation in any intelligible form. But wherever the bishop of the place has directed the use of a certain form, respect for his authority requires that it, and it alone, should be employed; though, of course, he could not make the use of a given form a *sine qua non*, or an essential condition of the indulgence.

The formula mentioned by our correspondent would seem to do as well as any other, though there are certain words in it which suit only the case for which the formula was intended. If this formula be used, we think it will suffice to begin with the words, *Dominus noster Jesus Christus*.

From the Appendix to the Roman Ritual² we take the

¹ ". . . Quapropter tunc impedimentem aufertur quando confessarius id poenitenti aliquo modo indicat seu pronuntiat." Lehinkuhl, v. 2, n. 818, iv.

² Page 207, ed. Pustet, 1881. This formula was used for granting a Plenary Indulgence to Franciscan Tertiaries. In 1882 another form was prescribed for this purpose, and for this purpose *must* be employed. Brief of Leo XIII., July 7, 1882.

following formula for granting a plenary indulgence, with its rubric:—

“In Sede Confessionali, Confessarius hanc breviorē formulam aut similem aliam adhibere potest.

“Auctoritate apostolica, mihi in hac parte commissā, absolvo te ab omnibus peccatis tuis in quantum possum, et restituo te Sacramentis Ecclesiae, et consedo tibi Indulgentiam plenariam. In nomine Patris ✠ et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.”

This would be a very convenient form for the purpose about which our correspondent inquires, and we beg to call attention to the words of the rubric printed at the head of it. The words *aut similem aliam* bear out what has been said regarding the liberty of selecting any suitable form. A still shorter form is used for granting a plenary indulgence to the members of the third Order of St. Francis when circumstances render the use of the longer form inconvenient:

“Auctoritate a summis Pontificibus mihi concessa plenariam omnium peccatorum tuorum Indulgentiam tibi impertior. In nomine Patris et Filii ✠ et Spiritus Sancti, Amen.”

D. O'LOAN.

Correspondence.

THE PRYMER.

“SIR,—I am indebted to you for the able and generous review of my book, *The Prymer*, in your last issue.

“Will you permit me to add to that notice, the following rough collation of four MS. Prymers, when I think that, supposing my book to be altered to bring it into conformity with the results of this collation, we may possibly be in possession of the mediæval prayer-book. For such a purpose we must, however, omit all matter preceding the Hours, and all that following the Commendations.—I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

“HENRY LITTLEHALES.”

Em.—Emmanuel College Prymer, Cambridge.

C.U.—Cambridge University Library.

699. Rawlinson, C. 699.—Bodleian Library, Oxford.

S.J.—St. John's College, Cambridge.

Page 17. 699 substitutes 'God make me safe,' in place of 'Praise ye the Lord.'

Page 20. C.U. omits the Hail Mary; but the omission is probably unintentional, for all the other thirteen MSS. give it.

Page 28. In place of 'Show to us Thy mercy, and give us Thy health,' C.U. and 699 have 'Lord God of virtue, convert us, and show to us Thy face, and we shall be safe.'

Page 30. C.U., Em., and 699 substitute the Lord's Prayer for the Hail Mary at the commencement of Prime.

Page 33. C.U., Em., and 699 omit 'Show to us, Lord, Thy mercy, and give us Thine health.'

Em. omits the Hail Mary, but C.U. substitutes for it the Lord's Prayer.

Page 34. Preceding the Memento, C.U. and Em. give the Veni Creator.

Page 35. C.U., Em., and 699 omit 'Show to us, Lord, Thy mercy, and give us Thine health.'

Page 36. Em. omits the Hail Mary, but for it C.U. substitutes the Lord's Prayer.

699 omits 'Praise ye the Lord.'

C.U., Em., and 699 give Veni Creator before the Memento.

Page 38. C.U., Em., and 699 omit 'Show to us, Lord, Thy mercy, and give us Thine health.'

Page 39. 699 omits the Hail Mary, but for it C.U. substitutes the Lord's Prayer.

C.U., Em. and 699 give Veni Creator before the Memento.

Page 41. C.U., Em. and 699 omit 'Show to us, Lord, Thy mercy, and give us Thine health.'

C.U., Em., and 699 omit all following 'joys of paradise,' to the end of page 42.

Page 43:

All three have the usual commencement, 'God, take heed,' &c.

All three 'Praise ye the Lord.'

All three 'Lætatus sum.'

Ad te levavi.'

Page 46. C.U., Em., and 699 omit 'Veni sancte spiritus,' and all following up to the conclusion of 'Deus a Quo,' on page 47.

Page 48. 699 has the Lord's Prayer preceding Compline, and omits 'Praise ye the Lord.'

Page 51. After 'joys of paradise,' 699 gives the Lord's Prayer.

C.U. and Em. omit all between 'passed hence' and 'Oro.'

After the concluding prayer, 'Omnipotens sempiterne Deus,' C.U., Em., and 699 give all from 'Ave Regina,' on page 41, to the end of the Lord's Prayer, on page 42, concluding with :—

'And lead us not into temptation,
But deliver us from evil.
Everlasting rest, Lord, give to them,
And perpetual light shine to them.
From the gates of hell,
Lord deliver the souls of them.
I believe to see the goodes of the Lord
In the land of living men.'

C.U. 'Lord, hear my prayer, 699 and Em. 'Rest they in
and let my cry come to Thee.' peace.'

Em. and C.U. 'Fidelium 699 Lost.
Deus.' See page 74.

C.U. 'The souls of all faithful dead men, by the mercy of God, rest they in peace of Jesu Christ. So be it. Bless ye the Lord.'

Page 58. Em has at the conclusion of the Seven Psalms, 'Lord, have no mind of our guilts or of our kindred, neither take Thou vengeance of our sins for Thy name.'

Page 65. The Litany does not materially differ.

Page 69. 699 omits the prayer 'Omnipotens,' the omission being probably an error, for all other MSS. have it.

Page 73. The MSS., without exception, place 'Inclina Domine' before 'Deus Qui patrem.'

Page 74. 699 and C.U. omit 'Fidelium Deus.'

Page 77. C.U. and Em. omit the Hail Mary.

Page 86. C.U. and Em. omit the Hail Mary.

Page 88. Conclusion of the Matins not quite clear.

Page 91. 699 and C.U. omit 'Deus misereatur.'

Page 93. 699 and Em. omit 'Cantate Domino and Laudate Dominum.'

Page 94. C.U., Em., and 699 omit the Hail Mary.

Page 95. C.U. omits 'Rest they in peace. Amen,' probably in error; all MSS. give it. No Commendations in 699.

Page 103. C.U., and Em. omit the Hail Mary.

"CLOVELLY, BEXLEY HEATH,

"KENT, 9th September, 1891."

Documents.

THE S. CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDE FIDE.

PRIVILEGES GRANTED TO THOSE WHO TAKE PART IN HELPING
THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE
FAITH.

Bñe Pater,

Praesides Consiliorum centralium Operis a propagatione Fidei, humiliter provoluti ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae, instanter implorant, ut concedere in perpetuum dignetur privilegia et facultates sequentes Sacerdotibus addictis eidem Operi modis qui sequuntur, videlicet :—

I. Unicuique Sacerdoti, qui onus habeat in qualibet Paroecia aut in quolibet instituto, eleemosynas colligendi favore Operis a Propagatione Fidei, quaelibet aliunde sit vis pecuniae collectae, aut qui proprio aere exhibeat Operi vim pecuniae pro decem sociis :—

1. Altare privilegiatum ter in qualibet hebdomada :
2. Facultatem applicandi sequentes indulgentias : pro fidelibus in articulo mortis constitutis indulgentiam plenariam ; coronis precatoriis seu rosariis, crucibus, crucifixis, sacris imaginibus, statuís parvis et numismatibus indulgentias apostolicas, coronis precatoriis indulgentias s. Birgittae.
3. Facultatem adiungendi crucifixis indulgentias Viae-Crucis.

II. Culibet Sacerdoti, qui pertineat ad Consilium vel ad comitatum oneratum ad Operis negotia gerenda, etc.

Cullibet Sacerdoti, qui in anni circulum exhibuerit in capsam Operis summam pecuniae, quae saltem aequet vim pecuniae, quam mille offerrent socii, quaelibet, aliunde, esset origo huius pecuniae.

1. Eadem privilegia concessa sacerdotibus praecedentis ordinis :

2. Altara privilegiatum quinquies in hebdomada :

3. Privilegium benedicendi cruces cum indulgentia concedi solita exercitio viae-crucis ; et insuper facultatem imponendi chordas et scapularia s. Francisci cum indulgentiis et privilegiis concedi solitis per rr. Pontifices, huic impositioni :

4. Facultatem benedicendi et imponendi fidelibus sacra scapularia Montis Carmeli, Immaculatae Conceptionis et Passionis Iesu Christi Domini Nostri.

Casu autem quo summa pecuniae colligenda, haud esset, momento temporis, plena, dicti Praesides implorant a Sanctitate Vestra prorogationem facultatum favore Presbyteri illius qui exhibuerit integram summam praecedentis anni, usque ad exitum exercitii currentis.

III. Quilibet Sacerdos, qui una vice exhibuerit, de proprio aere, eam pecuniae vim quae aequet summam mille sociorum, ius habet, pro suae vitae tempore, ad privilegia concessa sacerdotibus, qui Consilii membra sunt.

Ex audientia SS^{mi} habita die 5 August, 1889.

SS^{us} Dominus Noster Leo divina Providentia PP. XIII., referente me infrascripto Archiepiscopo Tyren., S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario, expetitas extensiones indulgentiarum concedere dignatus est, easque in perpetuum pio Operi tribuit, excepta facultate benedicendi coronas, quam non ultra quinquennium concessit.

Datum Romae ex aedibus dictae S. Congregationis die et anno ut supra.

Pro R. P. D., *Secretario.*

PHILLIPUS TORRONI, *substitutus.*

Notices of Books.

WHITHER GOEST THOU? OR, WAS FATHER MATHEW RIGHT? Notes on Intemperance, Scientific and Moral. By Rev. J. C. MacErlain. Dublin: Browne and Nolan. 1891.

THE author of this extremely able indictment of alcohol has been for years, both in this country and in the United States, one of the most active and devoted advocates of total abstinence. On the very threshold of his missionary life, he was brought face to face with the demon of intemperance, and his heart at first sank within him before the apparently hopeless task of casting him from the throne on which he had succeeded in seating

himself so securely. But the cruel degradation of mind and body to which this tyrant reduced his slaves, and still more the appalling spiritual calamities he inflicted on them, fired the young priest's heart and nerved his arm ; and, like another David, he went forth to meet his gigantic foe, trusting in God to give him the victory. And God did not desert him. The eye that guided, and the arm that strengthened the hand of David, gave direction and force to the efforts of the young temperance advocate. Drunkenness disappeared, the tyranny of intemperance ceased, and in its stead the mild sway of total abstinence was established. And no sooner had he succeeded in emancipating the people of one district from this degrading slavery, than that Providence who has numbered the hairs of our head, and without whose knowledge and will not even the tiniest flower blooms or dies, ordained that he should gird himself against his old foe on a new battle-field, and free another district from his ignominious yoke.

Having spent several years at home in this close and ceaseless conflict, under the banner of total abstinence, Father MacErlain transferred his services to the "children of the dispersion," among whom he was aware intemperance was creating havoc still more hideous than among those that remained in Ireland. In the United States, he pushed on with vigour the relentless war he had long before declared against intemperance and against all its works and pomps. From the pulpit, from the platform, and through the press, he denounced in burning words the folly, the madness, the blood-guiltiness, the soul-guiltiness of excessive indulgence in alcoholic drinks, and pictured, in moving language, the horrible and ghastly scenes hourly enacted under the iron rule of this most degrading of all vices.

With a view to bringing the results of an experience at once so extensive and so varied within the reach of the largest number possible, Father MacErlain has put together the "Notes" which make up the present volume. The book is divided into two parts. The first deals with the physiological and pathological aspects of intemperance ; the second, with the moral aspect. In the first part, the author establishes with terrible conclusiveness, the fearful power of alcohol, as an agent of mental and bodily disease. From the testimony of the best medical authorities, on both sides of the Atlantic, he proves that alcohol "kills men and women wholesale, sending some to the grave straightway, and some to the grave through that living grave—the asylum for the insane."

We specially recommend this first part, not because it is better treated than the second, but because we have for a long time believed that were the conclusions arrived at by medical science regarding the abuse of alcohol made thoroughly familiar to the public, this knowledge would prove a more effective obstacle to the spread of intemperance than anything that has yet been devised. For this reason, we could have wished that Father MacErlain had drawn somewhat more largely on the piles of statistics and medical reports, of which he has given us specimens. He has, however, given enough to convince any impartial mind of the frightful evils which the victims of intemperance must undergo even in this world.

It is in the second part, however, that the author shows to greatest advantage. Here the moral aspect of intemperance is placed under review ; and we could wish, for the sake of God, and of the human race, that our author's arguments were less convincing and his facts less authenticated. But, unfortunately, we must admit the force of the one and the truth of the other ; and when we have realized the awful conclusion towards which both converge, unless we are devoid of all piety and all pity, from our hearts, crushed with the weight of the crimes against God, and of our brother's woes caused by intemperance, will ascend to God an ardent prayer, that He will remove the hideous thing from amongst us ; and in these same hearts will be formed a strong resolution to strive by word and example to save our brothers and sisters who perish eternally by this fatal soul-poison.

On page 103, are quoted some words from the Epistle to Titus, as follows :—" Speak thou the things that become sound doctrine ; that the aged men be sober, . . . that they may teach the young women to be discreet, chaste, sober." Now, from the manner in which these words are here given, one would infer that St. Paul, contrary to his usual custom, appointed the aged men to be teachers of the young women ; whereas, as a matter of fact, it was to the aged women that he much more appropriately allotted this task. We would suggest then, that in the next edition St. Paul's meaning should be made clear by some such arrangement of the words as this—" Speak thou the things that become sound doctrine ; that the aged men be *sober*, chaste, prudent. . . . The aged women in like manner . . . that they may teach the young women . . . to be discreet, chaste, *sober*." Do we owe " behooves," which occurs on page 104, to the

new American spelling or to a careless type-setter? And lastly, is not the following metaphor (page 145) slightly mixed?—"The cities are simply *rum-ridden* by a *Niagara* of beer, ales, and liquors, that surpasses all imagination, even in her wildest flights." The italics are, of course, ours.

We are glad to see that the press of all shades of opinion, in this country as in America, advocates the spread of this book. We desire to join our feeble voice to this great concert of praise which it has evoked, and we heartily wish its mission as much success as the learning, ability, and zeal of its author deserve. We should add, that in this edition are printed several highly complimentary letters, written to the author by eminent American prelates in acknowledging the receipt of copies of the first edition.

SERMONS FOR SUNDAYS AND FESTIVALS. By James Canon Griffin. London: R. Washbourne, 18 Paternoster-row.

THIS is a useful addition to our books of English sermons. They would, perhaps, be more properly styled plain homely lectures than sermons. Though short—few of them exceed six pages—they are very practical and instructive. The style is somewhat heavy, particularly in some of them, but the language is simple and intelligible for all; and there are no attempts at rhetorical effect, nor is there any waste of space on mere verbal eloquence. They would be valuable either for spiritual reading or would afford good matter for short homilies.

TWO SPIRITUAL RETREATS FOR SISTERS. By Rev. Ev. Trollner. Translated by Rev. A. Wirth, O.S.B. New York: Fr. Pustet.

It happens from time to time in a convent that a nun has to make a retreat for herself, and of course without the assistance of a preacher. Even sometimes a community is not able to secure a priest to conduct the exercises of the annual retreat, or of the retreat usual at the end of the year. In such cases the book mentioned above will be found to be a useful substitute for the preacher. The meditations are special to religious, and are models of order and clearness. Their vows and duties form the subjects of the considerations, and are treated in a solid and practical way.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DECEMBER, 1891.

“ANIMA DEO UNITA.”

“Creatura est anima a Deo ; vita a Vita ; simplex a Simpliciter ; immortalis ab Immortaliter ; magna a Magno ; recta a Recto ; eo magna, quo capax aeternorum ; eo recta quo appetens supernorum ; eo beata, quo Deo unita ”—ST. AUGUSTIN.

THE smallest trivialities suffice to amuse and entertain a child, because its mind is too feeble and undeveloped to grasp the great questions that are ever agitating the world. A rattle or a penny trumpet will occupy its entire attention, and it will be quite content to while away its time, digging in the sand with a wooden spade, or erecting imaginary castles and palaces with packs of cards. One may speak to it of bloody encounters on land and sea ; one may apprise it of events entailing the ruin of a nation or the disgrace of a people ; one may describe the disintegration or total destruction of an empire ; but it signifies little. So long as one does not seize its playthings, nor shatter its toy-house, one will scarcely trouble the infant, or even chase away the smile of joy from its face. It will continue its play with undistracted glee. The grown-up man, on the contrary, can no longer find any pleasure or interest in the playthings of a child. His mind is too full of wider, deeper, and more momentous thoughts—perhaps involving the welfare of his country or the peace of the world.

Now, from a spiritual point of view, the great masses of mankind closely resemble children playing upon the sand. They, too, occupy themselves in trivialities. The present moment

absorbs their attention. All their thoughts, all their desires, are centred on the passing and unstable things of time. Some deliver themselves up, body and soul, to money-making, and are wholly preoccupied in adding field to field and house to house, much as the child collects shells, or throws up mounds of sand, to be scattered by the fast incoming tide. Others engage themselves in seeking honours, distinctions, and decorations, and will lend an ear to the praise and flattery of men, with the same self-satisfied contentment with which a child will allow itself to be beguiled by the sound of a rattle, or the hum of a top.

The world, the pleasures of the world, the riches of the world, the honour, the distinctions, the glory, and the approbation of the world—such things gain possession of the hearts of the multitude. Perishable goods, fleeting pleasures, transitory fame; the glitter and the glare, the gilt and the tinsel, the meteoric splendours and phosphorescent glory of the vain frivolous world engross them, occupy them, interest them, excite them, control them, tyrannize over them, provoke their passions, stimulate their greed, arouse their desires, and drive them to the very ends of the earth in hot eager pursuit of fleeting shadows and bursting bubbles!

Children, every one! Infants playing with their toys—foolish, unreflecting, unreasoning—ready to start off in pursuit of every painted butterfly that chance sends fluttering and flittering across their sunlit path—children who refuse to be distracted or disturbed by anything of true importance. The deepest problems of life, the momentous questions of a future state, the solemn and all-important facts of the eternal and invisible world, awake no interest. Speak in the most persuasive tones of the most sublime and awful truths that can occupy the heart of man; of crimes that will re-echo through endless ages; of wounds which eternity itself cannot heal; of millions upon millions of sensitive human beings descending into the inextinguishable lake of fire; of a heaven to be won, and a hell to be avoided—yes, speak on; “cry, cease not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet;” and behold, they play on with the gewgaws and trumperies of life, as

deaf and as unheeding as plays the unreasoning child when you tell him that cities burn and nations perish.

To a man of vivid faith there is nothing so extraordinary or so appalling as the apathy, indifference, and insensibility of worldly-minded men to all that is most vital and significant, most essential and paramount. The saints of God, though in many respects like to us, and moulded out of the same clay, seem to live and move in a wholly different world. They looked beyond the present into the far-away future. The riches and honours and glory of the world were, no doubt, spread out and flaunted before *them* as before us. These things they indeed beheld, as they beheld the crimson and golden clouds floating in the western sky—beautiful, if you will—yea, gorgeous beyond all comparison; but perishable and passing, and unworthy of more than a momentary glance. Such coveted objects came to tempt the saints as they came to tempt others, but without success. They heeded them not, but brushed them aside without a sigh. Their thoughts were too much taken up with more important matters to heed such puerile distractions—too much pre-occupied with the great and eternal truths; with heaven and its unfading glory, its never-ending delights, its enduring and ineffable peace; with hell and its quenchless fires, its undying worm of remorse, its ceaseless, changeless, pitiless woe and misery. How could a saint become captivated or ensnared by earthly joys, whose eyes were ever riveted on the joys of heaven? How could he be terrorized or coerced by thought of earthly pains or worldly shame, or in any way swayed by the scorn or hate of men, whose mind was ever contemplating the terrors of the lost, and the shame and torments and never-ending despair of the stygian pit? No. The earth beneath his feet must ever remain a poor and contemptible object to one whose innermost thoughts are habitually fixed on the everlasting throne of the infinite God. To one who has heard "the voice of the Beloved, leaping over the mountains, skipping over the hills," the praises and adulation of the crowds must ever sound empty as the murmurs of the idle wind, meaningless as the sighing of the restless sea; while the glory of the world, when

compared with the splendours of the heavenly palaces, can never seem more than the finery and pageantry of a village fair.

In a word, a saint lives and moves among realities, while other men live and move among shadows, phantoms, and empty shows. A man of God apprises all things at their just value. He scans the entire earth; his eagle glance sweeps from pole to pole, and his subtle and penetrating eye at once perceives that in the midst of such an overwhelming variety of objects but one is truly valuable; but one stands out peerless and without a rival. “On earth,” he exclaims with the poet, “there is nothing great but man; in man there is nothing great but mind :” or, let us rather say, soul.

The soul! A single soul—the soul of the merest child, of a poor, ignorant, ragged, deformed, outcast child, the poorest and lowliest throughout all London—is, indeed, worth more than towns and cities, and all that they contain; worth more than thrones and dynasties, kingdoms and empires; yea, more than glowing sun and glistening moon, and the countless host of diamond stars glimmering and sparkling on the brow of night, and quiring to the cherubim! Of all created things on earth, the soul alone lives a charmed life. It alone is immortal and imperishable. All else must pass: all else must fall and fade and cease to be. The hardest rock, the toughest metal, the firmest wall of adamant, must crumble away. Weakness, frailty, change, dissolution, decay, and death! Ah! these are words clearly inscribed and engraved by the hand of Omnipotence on everything around us and about us. The soul is the only exception. It, and it alone, survives them all. It will endure; it will never pass away. Nations will come and go; dynasties will rise and fall; the mountains will be broken into pieces; the seas will evaporate and disappear; the earth itself will dissolve; the very stars shall fall from heaven; all creation will sway and totter to its ruin; the entire universe shall be gathered up like a scroll: but in the midst of the general destruction and universal change, the soul will retain its youth and beauty, and never, never know corruption.

The soul! Oh, who will endow us with power to under-

stand its worth and dignity! Who will furnish us with the means of portraying, even in a limited degree, its exquisite grace and unrivalled loveliness! Impossible in this life! To understand the loveliness of the soul, we must understand the loveliness of God, for to His image and likeness it is made. All things, of course, babble in an inarticulate manner of Him who made them. The wide-stretching ocean fills our ears with distant murmurs of His immensity; the soft-scented summer's breath discourses of His gentleness; the scintillating stars emit subdued glimpses of His beauty; and the tropical noon-day sun, as it sets the heavens in a blaze, seems to reflect something of His magnificence.

Nature in all its moods, and poetry and art, music and song, in all their varied forms and infinite expressions, seem to lisp His name; while earth and sky utter His praises and show forth His wondrous perfections. True. Yet not one of these—no, nor even all these put together—can tell us as much of God as could a single human soul in grace, were we but able to contemplate it in itself, and to understand and see it in its very essence, as we may one day hope to do in our home of light above.

Put all the visible creation on one side. Add world to world, and universe to universe, till mind grows weary and senses fail; place these accumulations of wealth and beauty on one side of the balance; and on the other lay but a single soul, clothed with the garment of grace. It will outweigh them all. For, as theologians teach, “*Bonum gratiae unius, majus est quam bonum naturae totius universi.*”

God became incarnate for the sake of souls. The least soul has been purchased by the life-blood of an Infinite Being. There is nothing of such value. In fact, as compared with it, all else is worth just nothing at all. It is almost terrifying to think of the treasure we carry about in such fragile vessels. A shudder runs through our frame, and our heart's blood seems almost to cease flowing, as we contemplate the awful responsibility that is ours, and the irrevocable choice that awaits our decision, and on which an eternity, with all its fathomless heights and depths, lies balancing.

Every Catholic duly instructed knows and believes this. It is the teaching of the Church, The saints did more than merely know and believe. They likewise realized it. With them it was a practical truth, one that affected them, and exercised a most perceptible influence on their lives and actions.

They argued:—1. The earth harbours nothing half so precious as a human soul. 2. It is made to the image of God. 3. It is redeemed by the death of the Infinite. 4. It is destined to bask for ever in the sunshine of God's presence, &c. Such was their premise. The consequence was an easy one to draw, viz., since the soul is all this, and far more, then it must follow that the noblest, highest, and most blessed and privileged work is to help souls, to labour and toil for them, and to devote one's life, talents, wealth, strength, and means to their service. It was thus that all the saints argued, and it was upon this principle that they all acted, each according to the measure of his opportunities.

We have a notable example in St. Charles Borromeo. Being a great saint, he was, as a consequence, marvellously illuminated in spiritual things; and being thus illuminated from above, he was enabled to recognise beyond others, the incomparable beauty of a soul. He used often to enlarge on this topic, and to point out that it is worth more than all the treasures of the world, as the devil well knows, who is so eager for its damnation. "A single soul," he exclaimed, "is worth the continual care of a pastor." On one occasion when he was trying to prevail upon a bishop to reside more continuously in his diocese, the latter excused himself, urging as a plea, that his diocese was but small, and could easily be managed by others. The saint, who was extremely grieved to find a prelate with so little pastoral zeal, made answer:—"A single soul is worthy of the presence and guardianship of a bishop." (*Life*, p. 389.) He not only manifested this zeal himself in his most laborious and incessant efforts to bring about the salvation of souls; but he strove, by every means in his power to infuse a corresponding zeal into the hearts of all others, and especially into the hearts of

his priests. On one occasion, in the diocesan synod, he placed before the clergy the example of St. Catherine of Sienna, in whom this zeal was so ardent, that she offered herself to God to suffer the pains of hell, in order to save souls who were on their way thither. After mentioning this fact, he cried out with much fervour: “ Oh, zeal, worthy of imitation by all Christians! If we could understand what it is to deliver a soul from hell, I doubt not but many of us would risk any danger in hope of saving at least one.”¹ How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the gospel of peace! No wonder, added St. Charles, that holy virgin of Sienna knelt down and kissed the very ground that had been trodden on by preachers because they were fellow-labourers of Christ. “ There is nothing more pleasing to God,” he continues, “ than to be helpers of His Son, and to be willing to undertake the charge of souls. Our holy Mother the Church rejoices in nothing more than in those who bring souls again to spiritual life, thereby despoiling hell, defeating the devil, casting out sin, opening heaven, rejoicing the angels, glorifying the Blessed Trinity, and preparing for themselves an unfading crown.” (See *Life*, page 370.)

It would be impossible, within the narrow limits of a single paper, to narrate the many instances of the saint's untiring zeal for the salvation of the brethren. Let it suffice to say, that their spiritual welfare was his continual thought night and day; and that both by word and example he ever strove, with unflagging energy, to win men to God. No opportunity was allowed to pass, no occasion was suffered to go by without being turned to the profit and advantage of his people.

When travelling in the mountain, he was wont to stop and hold converse with any of the poor mountaineers he chanced to meet, and stir up their faith and fervour by exhortations on spiritual things. Or he would gather a number of poor children together, and teach them in simple words the Christian doctrines, and then present them with

¹ St. Teresa writes:—“ To save even one, I would most willingly endure many deaths.”

a little reward, to give them courage and to stimulate their zeal. Once, when he was visiting the Levantine valley on foot, seeing a ragged little urchin sitting near a wretched hovel, at some distance from the road, he went up to him; and though he was but a poor little child, brought up among cattle and covered with dirt, he remained for some time with him, and taught him, with great charity and sweetness, to say the Our Father and the Hail Mary. His desire to assist souls for whom Christ died, was, indeed, coextensive with humanity. He seemed to include in his solicitude every inhabited part of the world. He strove to benefit every country, so far as it was possible; and for that purpose he kept up a continuous correspondence with bishops and archbishops, even in distant sees.

The example of St. Charles is, in a greater or lesser measure, the example of every saint. Nor could this be otherwise, for the love of man is a test as well as a testimony of the love of God. And in proportion as our love of God gains strength and power, will our love of the men and women, for whom He was crucified, likewise increase and strengthen.

One of the saddest and most deplorable facts forced upon our attention at the present day, is the extraordinary little interest in man's salvation exhibited by people living in the world. We are not now referring to Anglicans, Wesleyans, Methodists, and others who are dwelling in the twilight of heresy. We refer to Catholics who live and bask in the full brilliancy of the light of divine truth, and who might, therefore, be expected to be more filled with apostolic charity, and more inflamed with zeal for the hundreds of thousands perishing in their very midst.

A man who is at no pains to learn the unspeakable value of his own soul, will not set a very high price upon the souls of his neighbours. One who is making no notable effort to ward off sin and defilement from himself, and to preserve himself from every stain, is not likely to put himself out to any great extent to rescue his neighbours from contagion. Nor will a lukewarm Catholic, who displays no ardent aspirations and longings after perfection and a greater union

with God, develop any marked zeal for the sanctification of his fellows.

No, we must commence with ourselves. "*Charitas, bene ordinata incipit a semetipso,*" as St. Thomas teaches. We must start with a strong sense of the exalted dignity and measureless greatness and beauty of our own soul when in a state of grace; we must grow familiar with the fact that it is veritably a child of heaven, an adopted son of God, a brother of Jesus Christ, and an heir to an everlasting throne; and a participator of the divine nature. Then, but not till then, shall we be in a condition to appreciate at the same time the dignity and value of the souls of our brethren, made, as our own, to the image and likeness of God; and, as our own, purchased by the blood of an infinite Victim. When once that startling truth is borne in upon us, we shall certainly be the first to admit that no work or employment is so grand and ennobling in itself, so pleasing and gratifying to God, so honourable to ourselves or so profitable to others, as that which may promote the eternal welfare of the race.

Some Catholic laymen seem to think that such reflections have no application except to bishops, priests, monks, and nuns, and to persons especially consecrated to God. What a mistake! Are not the multitudes of the human race their brethren as well as ours, and just as truly as themselves children of the one Eternal Father above? Are they not equally redeemed by the same saving Blood, and destined to the same sublime honours and rewards in the realms of fadeless glory in heaven? And have they not as much right to claim the interests and sympathy, and solicitude of Catholic laymen as of priests and monks? Or, are lay people to watch the ravages of sin, and to contemplate the sea of iniquity raging on all sides, and souls perishing before their eyes, and to extend no hand to help a drowning brother, and to make no effort to rescue the perishing? In the midst of this wild, tempest-tossed, wind-swept, storm-driven world, are lay people to sit idly by, and fold their arms unconcerned, and throw the entire responsibility and care upon the priests? No! To look upon the cross of Christ, and to witness what He suffered for man's redemption, is to feel the necessity of

co-operating with Him to the utmost of one's power. All good laymen feel the truth of this. What they want is that priests should point out to them *what* they might do, and the *value* of the least work undertaken for the spiritual welfare of their neighbours.

They often ask, in a very diffident tone: "Ah! yes; but what can *we* do? We cannot preach, absolve, nor offer sacrifice. We can effect so little." We might answer:—Because you can do but little, is that any reason why you should do nothing? But, in sober truth, there is nothing little in any act or word that contributes, however slightly, to a soul's salvation; nothing trivial, nothing insignificant; nay, on the contrary, the smallest act is of inestimable value. And this is what, it appears to me, we as priests should help them to realize. Is it a great thing to enrich the poor; to feed the multitudes; to cure diseases; to still tempests; to create worlds; or to build up a universe? If so, it is a far greater thing still to diminish sin; to draw souls to God; to extend the faith; and to engraft virtue and eradicate vice. How clearly the saints understood this! "To make one step in the propagation of the faith," says the generous-hearted St. Teresa, "and to give one ray of light to heretics, I would forfeit a thousand kingdoms!" (Vide *Life*, chap. xxi.) It is of faith that one deliberate venial fault is an immeasurably worse evil than all physical pains, and than all material loss that man can sustain in this life; and far more deserving of tears and lamentations. If this be absolutely certain, it must be at least equally certain that to labour to diminish sin, infidelity, religious indifference, and neglect of spiritual duties, is a work of the very highest value and importance. If by the end of our lives we have succeeded in reducing the sum total of sins against God but by one, we shall not have lived in vain. Yet, if in earnest, the least influential amongst us may do vastly more than that. And how? the earnest layman may inquire. Then let me answer.

First, by preaching. Not in words, not in rounded periods, and balanced sentences, and rich sonorous phrases,

but by the far more efficacious means of example. No words are half so eloquent or half so persuasive as facts. A good life is a continuous exhortation. No man can live among men as a true, fervent, practical, honest, and sober Catholic without doing incalculable good. It is impossible. The mere presence of a noble, upright, generous character, who would scorn to do a mean or unworthy action, is itself a spur and an incentive to virtue; such a man inspires respect, admiration, and reverence; and from admiration and reverence to imitation and emulation there is but a short and easy step. We instinctively seek to imitate what we admire, and to resemble those whom we esteem and honour.

Secondly, by showing, in a practical manner, some real interest and concern in the welfare of others, and desiring to be of use to them. Opportunities arise again and again of helping inquirers and assisting the spread of truth; explaining difficulties, dissipating doubts, answering objections, interpreting apparent contradictions; and, in a word, of giving a clear and intelligible account of the faith that they profess. If we encourage Catholic laymen to interest themselves more in studying the Apologetics, the *motiva credibilitatis*, the history of the Church, and of the Church's doctrine, and a score of kindred subjects, they might render invaluable service to souls.

Thirdly, by employing their special gifts and talents more generously in the service of the brethren. How much might be done by possessors of large fortunes to advance the reign of Christ upon earth. What real assistance they might render to struggling missions, poverty-stricken churches, and schools, and institutions at home; as well as to the important missionary enterprises in far distant and inhospitable lands. Much, no doubt, is lost by the injudicious application of charity; and much is spent to carry out a whim or a personal hobby, which might have been laid out to far greater advantage, so far as souls are concerned. But of this we will not now speak. Others, again, who are blessed with intellectual gifts—with learning, leisure, and ability—might, surely, find abundant scope and occupation for their talents in other directions. To show what we mean, we need but

to mention such names as Digby, Allies, W. G. Ward, E. H. Thompson, C. F. Allnatt, O. A. Brownson, F. Ozanam, De Renty, Bernieres de Lourvigny, Du Pont (the holy man of Tours), the Comte A. de Mun, the late Herr Windhorst; to which might be added very many others, and women as well as men.¹

Fourthly, by throwing themselves generously into every good movement that is started with the approbation of authority, and uniting their efforts with those of others to make it a success. How frequently it happens that some enterprise, excellent in itself, and admirably conceived and planned, nevertheless proves abortive and fails, because Catholics prefer to criticize than to co-operate, and to raise objections rather than to raise subscriptions. It would be impossible to enumerate the various useful works and ventures to which the past five-and-twenty or fifty years have given birth, and which require the zeal and generosity of the faithful if they are to continue to succeed; but, perhaps we may venture to mention one or two as specimens of the rest. There is, *e. g.*, the Catholic Truth Society. It does an admirable work. And it may be helped in such a variety of ways. The rich may aid it by donations; the learned and leisured by writing tracts, papers, and essays; the poor by buying the leaflets, which cost next to nothing, and scattering them among their friends and acquaintances; and all by speaking well of it and wishing it God speed. Then there are Catholic papers which need support; and from time to time series of instructive lectures or addresses are delivered which—(a) some might assist in giving; which (b) others might encourage by attending, and which (c) all could help by advertising and making known among their companions. In fact, to one who ardently desires to help his brethren, thousands of ways lie open.

Fifthly, by encouraging and fostering religious and priestly vocations among the young. When parents are true, fervent Christians themselves, and Catholics to their very heart's

¹ The zeal, and devotion even, of certain non-Catholics, such as the late Lord Shaftesbury, and the Quakeress Mrs. Fry, might bring a blush to many a Catholic.

core, they will certainly realize how great and unparalleled an honour and blessing it is for them to be able to reckon among their children, at least one or two consecrated and dedicated to God and the service of the altar. Such parents will strive by the simple force of word and example to infuse their own spirit into their offspring, and again and again their ardent and continued prayers will obtain for son or daughter the gift of a supernatural vocation. The extraordinary thing is—first, that even fathers and mothers who are supposed to estimate spiritual things with some degree of accuracy, should often be so little anxious to see their children raised to the sublimest of all dignities, viz., to the unapproachable dignity of the priesthood; and, secondly, that even among the better class of young men themselves so few should be stirred by this noblest form of ambition.

"The real misery of the Church [Cardinal Mermillod justly observes] is to see how young men of the upper classes seem to be incapable of anything better than driving four-in-hand, shooting a cover, or applauding an actress. The honour of taking and holding the Blood of Jesus Christ is not given to them. Whole generations pass away before a family gives one son to the Church. Christian women! [he exclaims] your mothers' hearts do not burn enough with divine love that their exhalations should bring forth the heart of a priest. Oh! ask of God that your families may give sons to the Church. . . . ask Him that you, in your turn, may have the courage of sacrifice, and that from you may be born an apostle: to speak to men about God, to enlighten the world, to serve Him at the altar. Is not this, after all, a grand and magnificent destiny." (*Vide Mermillod on The Supernatural Life.*)

The last, but by no means the least important, means of co-operating with Jesus Christ in the work of saving souls, is frequent and fervent prayer. "The continuous prayer of the just man availeth much." To assist one another in this way is, indeed, a sacred duty; it is a special exhortation of the apostle: "pray for one another, that you may be saved." It is, furthermore, suggested by our Lord Himself when He teaches us to say, not "deliver *me*," but "deliver *us* from evil," and not "lead *me*," but "lead *us* not into temptation," &c.

It appears to me that we do not take sufficient pains to impress upon the faithful the duty of labouring according to their opportunities for the salvation of souls : nor do we sufficiently encourage them by pointing out the real value of the least act performed with this end in view. Perhaps if we were more zealous ourselves we would be more careful and solicitous to secure the valuable co-operation of every good man and woman, and more anxious to instil into them an active and self-sacrificing charity. *Qui non ardet, non accendit.* If we are to lead others to exert and strain themselves in this divine and inestimably grand work, it is imperative that we first lead the way, and by vigorous action, rather than by speech. "Not the cry, but the flight of the wild duck," says a Chinese proverb, "leads the flock to fly and to follow."

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

THE SACRIFICE OF IPHIGENIA.

THERE is a striking analogy between the story of the Grecian princess Iphigenia, such as it is represented to us in one of the master-pieces of Euripides, and that of a well-known heroine of the Old Testament, said to have been immolated by her father, Jepthe, in circumstances nearly similar. The resemblance has been noticed by many writers,¹ some of whom have gone so far as to assert that the Grecian legend is but a travesty of sacred history. The dates, they say, the names, and the principal characteristics of the story are the same. The events can be easily traced to a contemporary period ; the originating motive of the sacrifice was in both cases a patriotic one ; and the Greek word *Iphigenia*, when analyzed according to the rules of philology, can be resolved without difficulty into "Jepthe's daughter." Indeed the likeness becomes still more apparent when we remember that many important facts of sacred history are found disfigured in ancient mythology, and particularly in

¹ See Rosenmüller, *Das alte und neue Morgenland*, vol. iii., pages 41, 43.

the stories of the heroic ages, and that the poetry and dreams of Greece are often but the echoes of distant truths that grew weak as they spread, and, after they had passed through a long maze of corrupting popular traditions, were changed by the artifice of men of genius into harmonious fictions. Thus, Mr. Gladstone, in his interesting work, *Juventus Mundi*, draws attention to certain traditions traceable in Homer, which appear to be drawn from the same source as those of Holy Scripture. Amongst them he enumerates the idea of a deity which in one sense is three in one (Jupiter, Apollo, and Minerva); of a deliverer conceived under the double form of the "seed of the woman," a being at once human and divine; and, secondly, of the *Logos*, the word or wisdom of God; next of the woman whose seed this Redeemer was to be; and, finally, of a rainbow, considered as the means or sign of communication between heaven and earth. "If," he says, "in the progress of time, and with the mutations which the Olympian system gradually underwent, the marks of correspondence with the Hebrew records became more faint, the fact even raises some presumption, that were we enabled to go yet farther back, we should obtain further and clearer evidence of their identity of origin in certain respects."¹

From other sources we learn the existence in classical mythology of distinct and explicit traditions of many facts and doctrines of the Old Testament. Thus, Plato in the *Timæus*² records the popular belief in the flood, the history of which is also reproduced in the legend of Pyrra and Deucalion. Æschylus³ and Pindar⁴ speak of a final judgment. Hesiod,⁵ in the legend of Epimetheus and Pandora, gives us a glimpse of the happy state of man in paradise; of the introduction of sin and misery into the world; of the original innocence of the woman by whom it was introduced; and of the hope that from her, or from her race,

¹ *Juventus Mundi*, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, pages 207, 208.

² "Ὅταν δ' αὖ οἱ θεοὶ τὴν γῆν ᾤδασι καθαίροντες κατακλύζουσιν, οἳ μὲν ἐν τοῖς ὅρεσι διασωζόνται, &c., *Tim.*, page 5.

³ *Suppluces*, 230.

⁴ *Olympia*, ii. 58.

⁵ *Opp. et Dies.*, 26, 58.

would one day proceed a deliverer.¹ The same author, in his description of the garden of the Hesperides, with its apples protected by a fiery dragon, gives us the mythological picture of that original garden in which man's destiny was decreed. Cicero and Propertius point forward to a day of doom, when the stars shall fall and the earth shall crumble; whilst Lucretius speaks of the utter end and destruction of the world:—

“Una dies dabit exitio, multosque per annos.”

“Sustentata ruet moles et machina mundi.”

We have likewise in the heroic legends a tradition of the longer life of primeval man; of the rebellion of a primitive race against the Creator; and of a God suffering for the faults of men. It is not difficult to recognise the prototypes of Gyges and of Ephialtes, and of Briareus cast down beneath Mount Ætna, for his part in the revolt against the gods. But, in addition to this, it is asserted that the Greeks took possession besides of many historical events in Jewish history, and transferred them in somewhat altered guise into their own heroics. So convinced of this was the learned G. Vossius,² in the seventeenth century, that he regarded the *Iliad* as nothing more nor less than a Greek version of the destruction of Jericho; whilst Bochart³ and his learned disciple Huet, Bishop of Avranches,⁴ were of opinion that all pagan theology was derived from Moses, and that most of the legends of the ancient world drew their origin from the acts and writings of the same great personage. Finally, we have translated into English, in six volumes,⁵ the work of the Abbé Banier, written early in the last century, in which he undertakes to prove that, “notwithstanding all the ornaments which accompany fables, it is no difficult matter to see that they contain part of the history of primitive times.”

We are naturally not concerned here to stretch these shadows of the original substance beyond their real propor-

¹ See Dr. Döllinger's *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, pages 263, 274.

² *De Theologia Gentili et Physiologia Christiana*, pages 71, 77.

³ *Geographia Sacra*, lib. i.

⁴ *Demonstratio Evangelica*, cap. iii.: “Universa propemodum Ethnicorum theologia ex Mose, Mosivæ actis aut scriptis manavit.”

⁵ *The Mythology and Fables of the Ancients Explained from History*.

tions ; for the connection, after all, is but dim and distant. Indeed, notwithstanding these gleams of primitive tradition, there is nothing in the higher life of Greece so unaccountable as the monstrous absurdities of its religious thought and worship. It has ever been, and is likely to remain, a problem, insoluble at least upon natural grounds, how this people, who had achieved so much in philosophy, in poetry, in art, in science, in politics : who had opened up almost every mine of thought that has since been worked by mankind : who invented and perfected almost every style of poetry and prose that has been cultivated by the greatest minds that have come after them : who laid the deep and lasting foundation of the principal arts and sciences, and in some of them achieved triumphs never since equalled : who had an instinctive and artistic aversion to everything excessive and monstrous : and who at the same time professed a belief, however changeable and wavering, in the crudities and absurdities of what is handed down to us as their religion.¹ When, therefore, we assert that in the ancient mythology, properly so called, and in the legendary tales of Greece, we find undoubted vestiges of primitive revelation, as well as fanciful reproductions of some of the most notable events of sacred history, we intend no more than that some faint shadows, some misty silhouettes of original truth are traceable in the outlines of that extraordinary fabric ; and that in some special historical cases, such as the one which claims our attention here, analogies and resemblances apparently exist, which, if they are not sufficient to establish absolute identity, cannot fail, at least when examined and contrasted, to suggest the possibility of a common origin. The discoveries of Schliemann, and the critical efforts that have been made to establish the reality of the Trojan war, even were they conclusive, would prove no obstacle to the theory such as it is put forward ; for Homer makes no mention whatever of the sacrifice of Iphigenia, the account of which was, in all probability, gathered up from the legends of popular recital, and incorporated long after Homer as one of the events of the great journey. But, even should this

¹ See Max Müller, *The Mythology of the Greeks*.

theory of identity not commend itself to those who examine the general purport and details of the two stories, at least they shall find in them two examples of how these ancient peoples held it a duty of patriotism and of religion that no ties of domestic life however sacred—not even the bonds of paternal or filial love—should be allowed to stand between them and their devotion to the rightful cause of their native land. The manner in which this lesson is imparted, as well as the causes which have led us to notice the similitude of the stories, will best be brought out if we briefly relate them such as they have been transmitted to us—the one in the well-known tragedy of Euripides, the other in the inspired pages of the Book of Judges.

When the Grecian army was on its way to Troy it was detained by contrary winds at Aulis. This misadventure was attributed to the anger of Diana, whose favourite stag Agamemnon had slain. The leaders of the expedition are informed by a soothsayer that, in order to appease the goddess, they must sacrifice on her altar Iphigenia, Agamemnon's own daughter. The unhappy father is horror-stricken at this intelligence; and his first resolve, rather than shed the blood of one whom he loved so tenderly, is to disperse the whole body of the Greeks and renounce the expedition. The other generals represent to him the shame and humiliation that would result to Greece from such a course of action. Murmurs are already heard in the camp that he is about to betray the cause of which he had been chosen leader and guide by the assembled chieftains. Agamemnon hesitates, consults, falters; but at length the love of country prevails over kindred. The die is cast; and the fatal decree is issued, that, in order to save Greece, Iphigenia must perish. She is at once brought on to Aulis, on the pretence of a marriage with Achilles. Then comes the pitiful scene in which this dreadful decision is communicated to Clytemnestra, the victim's mother, and to the innocent and beautiful Iphigenia herself, both of whom had come to Aulis with thoughts of nuptials and of victory, but not of death. The distraction of Clytemnestra is boundless, and her sorrow inconsolable. Iphigenia, too, in all the freshness and bloom of life, bewails her sad lot in accents of

condensed grief, and would have given way to unutterable despair, were it not for the calm, though sorrowful, reasoning of Agamemnon, who gradually brings her to see how noble a thing it is to die for the people and to save the country. When she comes at last to realize the heroism of the sacrifice, she is no longer heart-broken, but even offers consolation to others, and directs her attendants to prepare the final rites:—

“Lead me : mine the glorious fate
To overturn the Phrygian state.
Illium’s towers, their heads shall bow.
With the garlands bind my brow,
Bring them, be these tresses crowned
Round the shrine, the altar round ;
Bear the lavers which you fill
From the pure, translucent rill ;
High your choral voices raise,
Tuned to hymn Diana’s praise,
Blessed Diana, royal maid.
Since the fates demand my aid,
I fulfil their awful power
By my slaughter, by my gore.”

Encouraged by her handmaids, and holding firm in her purpose, whilst the last preparations are being made, she still continues :—

“Swell the notes, ye virgin train ;
To Diana swell the strain ;
Queen of Chalcis, adverse land ;
Queen of Aulis, on whose strand
Winding to a narrow bay,
Fierce to take its angry way,
Waits the war and calls on me
Its retarded force to free.
O my country, where these eyes
Open’d on Pelasgic skies !
O ye virgins, once my pride,
In Mycenæ who reside !
Me you reared a beam of light ;
Freely now I sink in night.
Ah ! thou beaming lamp of day !
Jove-born, bright, ethereal ray !
Other regions me await,
Other life and other fate !
Farewell, beauteous lamp of day !
Farewell, bright ethereal ray ! ”

The prophet Calchas then draws from its sheath the sharp-edged sword, and as he was going to strike the fatal blow, Iphigenia disappears, and a deer is left in her place for the sacrifice. This supernatural change reanimated the Greeks; the winds became suddenly favourable; and the combined fleet set sail from Aulis. Iphigenia's innocence had excited the compassion of the goddess; and she is carried away to the Tauric Chersonese, to take charge of Diana's temple. Here other adventures await her in connection with Pylades and Orestes: and these, too, have been celebrated by Euripides and many subsequent imitators; but further than this it is not necessary to follow. The passage in Euripides, in which Iphigenia pleads for her life with Agamemnon, is considered one of the most beautiful and effective in the Greek language:—

“Had I, my father, the persuasive voice
Of Orpheus, and his skill to charm the rocks
To follow me, and soothe whome'er I please
With winning words, I would make trial of it;
But I have nothing to present thee now
Save tears, my only eloquence; and those
I can present thee.

Ah! kill me not in youth's fresh prime.
Sweet is the light of heaven: compel me not
What is beneath to view. I was the first
To call thee father; me thou first did'st call
Thy child. I was the first that on my knees
Fondly caressed thee, and from thee received
The fond caress; this was my speech to thee:
Shall I then live for thee? Shall I receive
My father when grown old, and in my house
Cheer him with each fond office, to repay
The careful nurture which he gave my youth?
These words are on my memory deep impressed.
Thou hast forgot them, and wilt kill thy child.”

The perplexity and despair that rack the breast of Agamemnon under these reproaches are beautifully expressed in the modern tragedy of Racine:—

“Ma fille, il est trop vrai, j'ignore pour quel crime
La colère des dieux demande une victime

Mais ils vous ont nommé, un oracle cruel
 Veut qu'ici votre sang coule sur un autel
 Pour défendre vos jours de leurs lois meurtrières
 Mon amour n'avait pas attendu vos prières.
 Je ne vous dirai point combien j'ai résisté
 Croyez-en cet amour par vous même attesté

Ma fille il faut céder, votre heure est arrivée
 Songez bien dans quel rang vous êtes élevée
 Je vous donne un conseil qu'à peine je reçois
 Du coup qui vous attend vous mourrez moins que moi
 Montrez en expirant, de qui vous êtes née
 Faites rougir ces dieux qui vous ont condamnée
 Allez ; et que les Grecs qui vont vous immoles
 Reconnaissent mon sang en le voyant couler."

The fate of Iphigenia has been ever a fruitful theme in literature, and there is scarcely any legend of Grecian story that has been treated by so many poets, both ancient and modern. Euripides follows his heroine to Taurica, and his drama on this portion of her history is, in many respects, superior to the other. The most notable attempt of the moderns to dramatize her Tauric adventures was that of Goethe ; but it turned out an almost absolute failure, and Professor Mahaffy but echoes the general opinion concerning it, when he says :—¹

"This play has been extolled far beyond its merits by the contemporaries of its great author ; but it is now generally allowed, even in Germany, to be a somewhat unfortunate mixture of Greek scenery and characters with modern romantic sentiment. It gives no idea whatever of a Greek play. . . . The whole diction and tone of it is full of idealistic dreaming and conscious analysis of motive which the Greeks would never have paraded on the stage."

A rather recent attempt was made in English poetry to celebrate that portion of the heroine's life which followed her return from Scythia ; but the success of Mr. Richard Garnett's effort, *Iphigenia in Delphi*, is not likely to encourage others. Indeed, the chief and lasting interest of Iphigenia is centred

in the sacrifice; and this it is that has gained for her such widespread acknowledgment.

Both Sophocles and Æschylus had written *Iphigenias*; but they were thrown into the shade by that of Euripides', published after its author's death. In the Latin classics, tragedies were composed, in imitation of the latter, by Naevius and Ennius. In the sixteenth century, an Italian version of it was written by Dolce, whilst his countryman Ruccellai dramatized *Iphigenia in Tauris*. In France, of many versions, the most remarkable was that of Racine; and in England, Potter's translation remains, we believe, the standard metrical version of this and all the other works of the same author.

We have only to remark, as a last word, that all the poets had not the same tradition respecting Iphigenia. Some of them represented her as having been actually immolated, without any device or escape, on the altar of Aulis. This is the version of the tradition which is given in the *Electra* of Sophocles; whilst in the Orestian trilogy of Æschylus, Clytemnestra says that Agamemnon, her husband, who had just expired, will meet, in Hades, Iphigenia, his daughter, whom he formerly immolated. This, too, is the version recorded by Lucretius in the commencement of his first book:—

“Aulide quo pacto Triviæ virginis aram
Iphianassæ turparunt sanguine foede
Ductores Danaum;”

and by Virgil, in the second book of *Aeneid*:—

“Sanguine placastis ventos et virgine caesa.”

There is a third opinion which is found in Stesichorus—one of the oldest lyric poets of Greece, and inventor of the epode—to the effect that at the last moment the priest of Diana discovered another Iphigenia, the illegitimate daughter of Helen and Theseus, who had been reared at Agamemnon's court, under the name of Eryphile, and who was plotting against Agamemnon's daughter for the hand of Achilles; that this was the Iphigenia who was really sacrificed; and

that the daughter of Agamemnon was accordingly saved. This is the theory which was adopted by Racine, who was glad to find some more artistic expedient than a miracle to save the life of so virtuous a princess; and he relies for his choice on the testimony of Pausanias, who says that this was the general belief in his own day through the whole country of Argos.

We now turn to one of the most singular episodes recorded in the Old Testament; and, whilst not committing ourselves by any means to the theory that this Grecian legend is but its mythical offshoot, we shall endeavour so to set it before our readers as to make plain the features in which the two stories coincide.

During that period of Jewish history which intervened between the last of the patriarchs and the accession of Saul, anointed and proclaimed king by the prophet Samuel, the country was governed by judges, who exercised supreme authority, much to the same extent as the *Suffetes* of Carthage, the *Archons* of Greece, or the *Dictators* of ancient Rome. Now, according to that visible providence, by which God dealt directly with His people, and through which He was pleased to give to mankind for ever, a glimpse of His inscrutable and eternal ways, the deeds of virtue or the crimes of this favoured nation were quickly followed by corresponding waves of prosperity or oppression. It is, indeed, an interesting study to trace how unerringly abundance or famine, peace or war, liberty or slavery, followed in their social and political life, according as they remained faithful to the God of their fathers, or turned to the ways of idolatry and wickedness.

It was in pursuance of this divine economy, almost mechanical in the certainty of its working, that Judaea was oppressed not long after the death of her champion Gedeon, by the bold and warlike race of Ammon, who dwelt to the east of the Jordan, between Arabia and Coelosyria. The disasters that overtook the Jews in the course of this warfare, were the result of their crimes; for as the sacred writer tells us:—"The children of Israel, adding new sins to their old ones, did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served idols,

Baalim and Astaroth, and the gods of Syria and of Sidon, and of Moab, and of the children of Ammon, and of the Philistines; and they left the Lord, and did not serve Him.”¹

When the chastisement due to such ingratitude and infidelity was now falling heavily upon them, they had recourse, in their misery, to that clement God who had so often pardoned them, and who, in spite of so many delinquencies, still cherished them as His own; and when they had “cast out of their coasts the idols of the false gods,” He allowed Himself to be touched once again by the sufferings of His people, and sent them a deliverer in the person of Jephthe.

Jephthe was the bravest man of his day, and was called by his countrymen “the able in war.” His great reputation was due to his courage, and his courage was formed and tried in misfortune; a vice of birth stained his origin. His mother was a stranger, according to some; a spouse of the second order, according to others. The children of all such unions were regarded with disdain in Israel, and they did not inherit like the children of the legitimate wife. Jephthe was, therefore, driven from his home by his brothers, who said to him: “Thou canst not inherit in the house of our father, because thou art of a different mother.”² Whether it was that he had no appeal from this hard exclusion, or that a formal decision was given against him, Jephthe fled to the southern part of the land of Galaad, and began the life of warlike adventure which soon made him famous in the neighbouring country. Some poor men, wanderers like himself, linked their fate with his, and elected him their chief, on account of his bravery. Under his command, frequent incursions were made into the territory of the enemies of Israel. He is believed to have inspired some sentiments of honour and patriotism into that strange kind of life, and some of the best commentators acquit him of the charge of having exercised regular rapine or brigandage, or of ever having abused his power in order to oppress the weak.

¹ Judges, x. 6.

Judges, xi. 2.

It was in the surroundings of such a life that the daughter was born, whose memory has survived with that of Jepthe himself. Nothing, however, is known of her existence till the occurrence of the sad event which made her celebrated in Jewish annals. Even her name is withheld from us by the inspired writer: perhaps as a lesson to those who are so ready to mark with the seal of their personality whatever meritorious actions they are able to accomplish.

As the Ammonites pressed hard upon the sons of Israel, we are told that the ancients of Galaad sought the assistance of Jepthe, whose fame had reached them. Amongst those who waited upon him with that object were some of his own brothers, or perhaps of the judges who had formerly decreed his exclusion; for his answer was: "Are not you the men that hated me, and cast me out of my father's house? and now you come to me, constrained by necessity."¹ It was only when they had promised to make honourable amends for their former harshness, by raising him, in the event of victory, to the position of Prince of Galaad, that Jepthe consented to undertake the command.

Jepthe, like all men who are conscious of their strength, and who shudder at the miseries of bloodshed and death, was moderate as he was brave. He at once opened negotiations with the enemies of Israel, and endeavoured by the peaceful methods of diplomacy to bring about a settlement of their quarrels. But the King of the Ammonites, elated by success, would not listen to his proposals, and there was no alternative but war. The new commander accordingly went in haste through the neighbouring country to get some troops together. In a few days he was ready for the march. It was then that he made to the Lord the memorable vow:—"If thou wilt deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, whosoever shall first come out of the doors of my house, and shall meet me when I return in peace, the same shall I offer a holocaust to thee."²

The Ammonites were soon vanquished: they lost a great number of men; their towns and villages were pillaged.

¹ Judges, xi. 7

Judges, xi. 31.

The victorious general smote them from Aroer to Mennith, and returned in triumph to his home at Maspha. His daughter, who was an only child, came forth to greet him, cheered by the sounds of music and the joyous choirs of her companions. When the quarrels of Israel ended in victory, the women and maidens went forth to receive the conqueror with all the accompaniments of gladness. Saul and David had received a triumph of the same kind after the defeat of the Philistines and the death of Goliath; and, long before the time of Saul, the passage of the Red Sea was similarly celebrated by Mary, the sister of Moses, and all the women of Israel.

But the brightness of the happiest days is sometimes darkened by events of extraordinary sadness. In the midst of the ovation, Jepthe perceived his daughter, and remembering his fatal vow, he rent his garments, and in grief and tears proceeded to inform her of the solemn promise he had made. The noble virgin submitted resolutely to her fate. There was no display of weakness here, or pleading for life. "Do unto me," she said, "whatsoever thou hast promised, since the victory hath been granted to thee and revenge of thy enemies." She had but one respite to ask—that she might be allowed to retire to the mountains for two months to bewail her virginity with her companions. It was no unusual thing for Jewish families whenever any disgrace or disaster befell them to retire to the mountains, where the grandeur and solitude of nature was calculated to nourish, but likewise to modify and charm, their sadness. There, besides, they could give outward expression to their sorrow without much restraint; differing in this from modern peoples, whose education teaches them to envelop mourning in a sort of ceremony which tempers the natural grief, and keeps it under the control of social customs.

Jepthe granted his daughter's request, and allowed her to retire for the time she had specified. The delay, no doubt, added to the pain of the sacrifice. It is a common thing enough to become electrified in the shock of events, and to give in the freshness of enthusiasm an example of heroic but instantaneous courage. It is more difficult and far more rare to

look the danger for a long time in the face, and to approach it with calm and manly courage. The interval, however, was not uneventful for Jephthe. Jealous of the conqueror of the Ammonites, the people of the tribe of Ephraim rose in rebellion against him, and gave as a pretext for their conduct, that they had not been called out against the common enemy. This plea was not justified, for Jephthe said to them: "When I and my people had a great strife with the Ammonites, I called you to assist me, and you would not. Nevertheless I put my life in my hands, and passed over against the children of Ammon, and the Lord delivered them into my hands. How then have I deserved that you should rise up and fight against me?"¹

This reasoning was of no avail, and Jephthe was obliged to have recourse to arms. Once again he gathered his dispersed troops, and attacked the Ephraimites, who had advanced over the Jordan. They were soon defeated, and driven back to the river, which they could not cross, as its banks were protected by the troops of Jephthe. Those who desired to cross were asked: "Art thou of Ephraim?"—for the military costume was the same. The fugitive, to save his life, answered that he was not. "Say then the word *Shibboleth*," retorted the soldiers of Galaad, with an accent and pronunciation peculiar to their country. The Ephraimite, pronouncing according to the manner of his tribe, said "*Sibboleth*;" and, when thus recognised as one of the enemy, was immediately put to death.¹ The campaign was perfectly decisive, and peace was again restored to the country. On his return from this expedition Jephthe found his daughter; and then, it is supposed, the vow was fulfilled.

It is difficult to say precisely in what the holocaust promised and offered by Jephthe consisted. The Scripture itself seems to veil the episode from us in the general terms which it employs, and we are left in doubt as to how the vow was actually executed. It is certain that up to the eleventh

¹ Judges, xii. 1-3.

² In modern times a similar device was resorted to. It was on the occasion of the famous massacre of the "Sicilian Vespers," when the French fugitives were asked to pronounce the word "Ciceri."

century the opinion of the Fathers, founded on Jewish tradition, as well as that of commentators and exegetes, understood it to be an immolation in blood of the tender and innocent victim, carried out by Jephthe himself; and the same was the opinion of St. Ambrose, and also of St. Thomas, who blames the father for his inconsiderate vow, and still more for its "impious execution."¹ It was on the authority of such learned interpreters that Dante based his reference when speaking of the binding force of vows in *Paradise*:—²

"Let mortals, then, no vows in jesting say;
 Be faithful nor to act so rashly stirred
 As Jephthah was his first chance vow to pay
 Who more becomingly had said 'I've erred,'
 Than to do worse in bondage to such ties.
 Nor less the blame the Greek's great duke incurred
 Whence wept Iphigenia her fair eyes,
 And made tears flow alike from fool and sage
 When they heard tell of such a sacrifice."

In modern times other interpretations sprang up and met with considerable favour. The chief one is that Jephthe meant only in the case of his daughter to consecrate her in a special manner to the ministrations of the temple, and to bind her to virginity. They rely for their proofs on the horror with which God regarded human sacrifices, and their express prohibition in the old law, as well as upon the sacred text, which says that immediately before Jephthe formulated his vow "the Spirit of the Lord came upon him;" that it was to bewail her virginity that his daughter retired to the mountains; and, finally, that when her father had done to her as he had vowed, "she knew no man." The word holocaust would thus be taken in a merely figurative sense.³ They also recall the words of St. Paul in his Epistles to the Hebrews,⁴ where he associates Jephthe with Gedeon, Samuel and David, as amongst those "Who by faith conquered

¹ *Summa* 2^a 2^{ae} quest. 88.

² Canto vi.

³ Some Hebrew scholars hold that the text should be translated: "Sit Jehovae aut offeram in holocaustam," but the best authorities support the translation of St. Jerome

⁴ Hebrews xi. 32, 33.

kingdoms, wrought justice, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, recovered strength from weakness, became valiant in battle, and put to flight the armies of foreigners."

No doubt there are strong objections to this solution of the difficulty, arising both from the terms employed in Scripture and from the well-known habits and aspirations of the Jews. The word "holocaust" is never used figuratively elsewhere. Virginitv was regarded with disfavour, on account of the hopes of the Messiah. The words of the text are very energetic, and seem to indicate by their force that a real immolation was intended. And yet, were it not for the undoubted weight of primitive tradition,¹ we should unquestionably plead a partiality for this opinion. The whole nation, as it appears to us, would have recoiled in horror from the slaughter, by her own father, of a person so innocent. Jepthe is not blamed for his act in the Old Testament. He is praised by St. Paul for his faith. The Spirit of God had come upon him, as we are told, when he formed his vow. And although there is no other record of a spouse consecrated to God in virginitv before the Blessed Virgin, may it not have been that Jepthe's daughter, on account of her innocence and virtue, was privileged to resemble in that figurative time the chosen spouses of the New Law? May she not have foreshadowed, even at such a distance, her who by her interior beauty and the charm of the highest virtue was to become the mother of God, and have given an example amongst an earthly and sensual race of that virtue which Christ our Lord was to embellish and to consecrate, which has adorned His Church from the days of the Apostles and the martyrs, and which by the effective aid which it has lent in establishing the prestige of mind over matter, of right over violence, has contributed so largely to the supremacy in the world of European civilization, and to the progressive mansuetude of manners and customs in modern times?

Judaea solemnized by a public ceremony the sacrifice of the daughter of Jepthe. Every year the virgins of Israel assembled to weep the noble victim of patriotism and filial

obedience. This festival, which lasted for a long period, was corrupted in the course of time. In the fourth century of our era we find the still pagan cities of Sebasta and Naplouse, formerly Samaria and Sichem, giving idolatrous honours to the heroine of Maspha. A fame more worthy of her character has survived in Christian art.

In poetry one of the most touching of Lord Byron's Hebrew melodies commemorates her sacrifice, which he too regarded as a holocaust in blood.

In the illuminated Bibles, the stained glass and paintings of the middle ages, both father and daughter also find an honoured place.

J. F. HOGAN.

LEO XIII. AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.—II.

“CORRUPTIO” ET “SANATIO.”

AN interesting and instructive study, not unmixed with amusement, would be the work of collating and contrasting the various curious and contradictory readings which have been worked into the text and between the lines of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* by the ingenious prejudices of Protestant writers and journalists. One class represent the Pope's words as the utterance of a convert to democracy, or the tardy and compulsory confession of an “effete old-world power” that it is impotent to resist “the onward trend of humanity,” and would, therefore, desire to boil back to youth its aged vigour by an indiscriminate burning of past principles and records beneath the cauldron of progress. Another class declare that all this whining sympathy with the poor labourer was to be expected from “the Church of the beggar”—the Church which degrades the people by her doctrine and practice of charity; and that, after all, nothing new is taught, nothing but some commonplace maxims of morality spiced with much talk of the “Church,” and of certain empty impossible ideals.

The design of this paper is to deal with both these views of the Encyclical; but mainly with the first, which declares that the teaching of our Holy Father means a complete

change of front on the part of the Church ; that it is nothing more nor less than “the boldest bid for the labour vote ;” that its real significance, now that the Pope has committed himself and cannot withdraw, amounts to this—“instead of being the blackcoated gendarme of the oppressor, the Catholic Church is to become the tribunal of the oppressed.” In order to make it quite clear how offensive is this false concoction of journalistic commentary, which is often administered to the public with an infusion of lavender-water sympathy and supposed appreciation, it will be well for us to compare the relative effect of Catholic and Protestant action and principles on the people during the past three hundred years, more particularly in England. Such a retrospect, while affording a refutation of certain would-be Popes of Printindom—self-constituted guides and infallible advisers of the “English-speaking folk”—will better enable us to understand the present, and to some extent may serve to warn and forearm us for the future.

“Quod si quis sanæ mentis [says our Holy Father in his very first Encyclical]¹ hanc ipsam qua vivimus ætatem, Religioni et Ecclesiæ Christi infensissimam, cum iis temporibus auspiciatissimis conferat, quibus Ecclesia uti mater a gentibus colebatur, omnino comperiet ætatem hanc nostram perturbationibus et demolitionibus plenam, recta ac rapide in suam perniciem ruere ; ea vero tempora optimis institutis, vitæ tranquillitate, opibus et prosperitate eo magis floruisse, quo Ecclesiæ regiminis ac legum sese observantiores populi exhibuerunt.”

The Catholic Church is the only life principle of society, he declares ; she made existing nations what they are by being to them a nurse, a gentle mistress, and a mother in the growing infancy of humanity. She it was who lifted the yoke of slavery from off the necks of the lowly toiler, and restored him to the dignity of his noble nature ; she unfurled the standard of redemption in every quarter of the globe, bringing in her train the arts and sciences, and shielding them by her protection ; she founded and maintained excellent institutions for the relief of all the misery, sickness, and poverty of life ; she rescued from squalor and

¹ *Inscrutabili Dei.*

degradation the poor and helpless ; she showed herself everywhere a power to save and civilize mankind. Then, after a masterly diagnosis of the malady afflicting society in our days, he proceeds, in the same Encyclical, to state his unalterable conviction that the cause of the evils of modern times lies above all in the rejection or contemptuous disregard of the authority of the Catholic Church ; and it is precisely because they are well aware that Catholicism is the bulwark of true progress, that the enemies of social order and social peace direct all their efforts towards tearing its principles and its influence, root and branch, out of the midst of humanity. But any contrivance which calls itself civilization, while discarding her aid, direction, and authority, is spurious and futile. “ Declinare ab instituto *corruptio* est : ad institutum redire, *sanatio* est.”¹ There is no remedy for society without the Church and the Holy See ; without her the life-principle of civilization and progress is dead, and there is no healing, because there is no foundation for health.

It is strange, indeed, that the flippant journalists who pretend to have turned Rome inside out to discover the possibility of a “ humanized papacy,” should not have made some reference to these persistent claims of Leo XIII., and of all his predecessors. Let us for this very reason bring these claims home by pursuing the parallel suggested by our Holy Father between the past and the present of society, with special reference to England.

There was a time, then, in England when men hearkened to the Church ; when the Blessed Sacrament restrained their earth-tending passions and raised their thoughts to the more real world that lies behind these material veils ;² when penance, public and private, brought the oppressor and defrauder to his knees ; when rich and poor associated as brothers in the house of their Father.³ Those were the days in which fraternity and equality were real existing facts, and not empty names for impossible ideals ; when the free

¹ *Rerum Novarum*.

² Fr. Bridgett, *Hist. of Holy Eucharist in Great Brit.*, vol. i., cap. ult.

³ *Ibid.*, and Dr. Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches* (Eng. trans.) page 153.

institutions Englishmen are so justly proud of were built up and consolidated by earnest prelates and sons of Holy Church. Out of barbarism, within a brief space, had grown a system of strong moral control by a spiritual power over the material works necessary for man, by reason of the original law of labouring in the sweat of his brow. Painfully, and with opposition, it is true, that system was established and maintained; but its influence was felt and acknowledged by the noble and the serf, by the lord and the villein, to their mutual benefit, as well spiritual as temporal, so long as England held the faith. And the mediatorial authority of the earthly representative of Christ, the organ of the highest spiritual power, intervened to stay the tyranny of the crowned violators of order, or of the wealthy oppressors of the poor, and to raise and protect the down-trodden and the helpless. "He [the Pope] was feared by delinquents of every class," says Archbishop Kenrick, "by the haughty baron and the proud emperor, as well as by the humble vassal; and when the thunder of his censure rolled, the prison doors flew open, the hand of avarice let fall the wages of injustice, and the knees of the oppressor beat together."

"Profecto Decessores Nostri [declares Leo XIII.]¹ *ut populum bono prospicerent*, omnis generis certamina suscipere, graves exantlare labores, seque asperis difficultatibus obicere nunquam dubitarunt: et defixis in coelo oculis neque improborum minis submisere frontem, neque blanditiis aut pollicitationibus se ab officio abduci degeneri assensu passi sunt. Fuit haec Apostolica Sedes, quae dilapsae societatis veteris reliquias collegit et coagmentavit; haec eadem fax amica fuit, qua humanitas Christianorum temporum effulsit; fuit haec salutaris anchora inter saevissimas tempestates quæ humana progenies jactata est; sacrum fuit concordiae vinculum quod nationes dissitas moribusque diversas inter se consociavit; *centrum denique commune fuit, unde cum fidei et religionis doctrina, tum pacis et rerum gerendarum auspicia ac consilia petebantur.*"

"L' intérêt du genre humain [says Voltaire] demande un frein qui retienne les souverains" (capitalistes), "et qui met à couvert la vie des peuples; ce frein de la Religion aurait pu être, par une convention universelle, dans la main des Papes. Ces premiers pontifes, en ne se mêlant des querelles temporelles que pour les

¹ *Inscrutabili Dei.*

apaiser, en avertissant les rois et les peuples de leurs devoirs, en reprenant leurs crimes, en réservant les excommunications pour les grands attentats, auraient toujours été regardés comme des images de Dieu sur la terre. *Mais les hommes sont réduits à n'avoir pour leur défense que les lois et les mœurs de leurs pays : — lois souvent méprisées, mœurs souvent corrompues !*"

If now we go forth into the highways and byways of this great industrial nation, whose "industrial organization is the most highly developed organization known to industry,"¹ we shall find everywhere, side by side with wealth and liberty, poverty and oppression; everywhere, beneath the thin crust of habitual security, signs of a seething mass of volcanic matter, threatening a speedy and ruinous upheaval; everywhere men talking of social danger; everywhere a clang of alarm bells—the ground tone of which is "Darkest England"—sounding through the length and breadth of a land which our neighbours have long been bidden to look on as flowing with the milk and honey of unexampled prosperity. And the reason of all this turmoil will assuredly not be far to seek. In the lordly mansion of the millionaire and in the wretched hovel of the sweater's victim; in the broad, rich square or street and in the foul alleys and slums; in the palace and in the cottage, we shall read the selfsame tale and see the selfsame motive-power in operation. Greed of gain, living for this world and this world alone, has made Englishmen, in general, a race of money-hunters, or an enormous tribe of mere wealth-producing automats. "If we would do anything towards the betterment of our countrymen," says J. S. Mill, "we must check and keep within bounds their excessive spirit of industrialism." There is no longer any higher enduring ideal, any more constant principle to guide and elevate, than the principle of self-interest, which in practice is too often synonymous with boundless selfishness. True, there is *esprit de corps*, "standard of respectability," and all the other constituents of "the Ethical ideas and feelings, which are evolved under the action of the Social and Political Sanctions." But are not these as fickle and incompetent for

¹ F. A. Walker, *Polit. Econ.*

good as the many-headed monster, human respect, from which they had their birth, and quite unable to cope with the lion of passion within the human heart? The purely material standard, which as a nation we make our main aim and guide, chokes all aspirations after a loftier existence than the life of sense; we are become, as a nation, essentially of the earth earthy.¹

This divorce of social and industrial life from religion and morality, and the consequent degradation, material and moral, into which as a nation we have fallen, is due to the ideas, the doctrine, and the practice of the Reformation. Rebellion against all authority, the spurning of all restraints, the levelling of all restrictions—such were the leading and essential ideas of that movement. Mutual support and subjection, mutual service and protection, which should, and did, underlie the whole constitution of Christian States, were thoroughly alien to the mind of the Reformation.

Protestantism, moreover, necessarily led to a lowering of the standard of national morality both by direct teaching and action, and by indirect influence.

The banishment of the sacraments from among the people took from the toilers their main solace in their hard lot, by depriving them of almost their only remedy against the paralysis of spirit caused by the wearisome monotony of their labours, while it removed the most effective restraint on injustice and oppression by freeing the consciences of employers from the dread of penance and of ecclesiastical censure; to say nothing of the sacramental grace, the great antidote against sin, of which they were simultaneously robbed.

Then, how could men continue to look upward to Heaven for guidance in conduct, or for true courage and strength in difficulties; how could they say, as they had said for so long, "Prevent, O Lord, our actions by Thy holy inspirations,"

¹ "One of the things," says Mr. Ruskin (*Sesame and Lilies*), "which a great nation does *not* do—it does not mock Heaven by pretending belief in a revelation which asserts the love of money to be the root of all evil, and declaring at the same time that it is actuated, and intends to be actuated, in all chief national deeds and measures by no other love."

when they were bidden "to trust in Christ, and sin boldly, for faith alone sufficed"? Who does not see the depravity of morals that would necessarily follow on the admission of principles like these? Men might become an aggregation of fighting animals, rending and tearing one another for money and wealth, yet have quiet consciences, "for the merits of Christ covered all transgressions!"

Protestantism rent humanity into as many fractions as there were individuals, by tearing men from the centre of unity, the visible head of Christ's mystic body, and by multiplying opinions—allowing each member of society to choose what doctrines he would; and, consequently, to follow what line of conduct suited his fancy. Private judgment means ultimate anarchy, as well in the practical working of governments and industrial systems as in faith and speculative science. For, be it observed, the method of private judgment—the testing of divine truths by the sole light of human reason—the refusing to accept divinely attested facts, save when proved to the satisfaction of human understanding—has led on by a natural and foreseen result to the total denial of Christianity, of revelation, of God; and has left men to toss, bewildered and blinded, without rudder or compass, amid the storm and spray of a pantheistic, materialistic, or agnostic atheism: "*ut jam ipsum rationalem naturam omnemque justæ rectique normam negantes, ima humanæ societatis fundamenta diruere conitantur.*"¹ "Phæton," to use the language of Cardinal Newman,² "has got into the chariot of the sun; we, alas!" he exclaims—while Hegel and Buddha and "Liberalism;" tear and rend the fragmentary faith still left to his beloved Oxford—"can only look on, and watch him down the steep of heaven. Meanwhile, the lands which he is passing over suffer from his driving."

Protestantism likewise destroyed the ideal of purity and virginity. Its hatred of devotion to our Lady shows this

¹ *Concil. Vatican.; Constitutio de Fide Cathol.* Cf. Card. Manning, *Four Great Evils of the Day*, Lecture I.; also Fr. Bridgett, *Sir Thomas More*, page 215.

² *Apologia.*

beyond dispute; and the contemptuous utterance we frequently hear from Protestant lips of the name of the "Virgin" is a striking indication of the lowering effect which the religion of a married clergy has had on the moral ideals of its adherents. "And here we are reminded of the confraternities, societies, and religious orders, which have arisen by the Church's authority, and the piety of the Christian people. The annals of every nation down to our own times testify to what they have done for the human race."¹ But the Reformers seemed to have little care or thought for the good of the human race! The monasteries and convents were ruthlessly swept from off the face of England, and thus the possibility of living up to the evangelical counsels—"the full liberty which *all* possess either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity, or to enter into the bonds of marriage,"² was taken away—the ideal and standard of highest Christian perfection was destroyed! And marriage itself, the great mystery representing the nuptials of the Word with our human nature and of Christ with His Church—"the sanctity of which," says Balmez,³ "is the first pledge for the good of the family, the foundation-stone of true civilization," has been dragged through the mire; first, by the conduct and teaching of the Reformers; and, lastly, by "the civil laws, which have been so much at fault in this respect for the last hundred years."⁴ And what of the teachings of Malthus, Mill, and the leading economists of this century hereon? Whatever may be the truth of their theory of population, they at least clearly perceived this glaring defect of our boasted modern civilization—that there exists no effectual barrier against the basest passions and lowest tendencies of humanity. For generations they have cried aloud for "checks," for remedies; but apparently all in vain. The bestial horrors of large overcrowded towns—the curse of our times—have gone on increasing rather than diminishing. What shall stay the disorder?

¹ Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.

² *Ibidem*.

³ *Protestantism and Catholicity*.

⁴ Encyclical, *Arcanum*, Feb. 10th, 1880.

The "checks" proposed by Malthus? They have already been weighed in the balance and are found wanting; *wanting*, because they are not informed by the principle of true religion; *wanting*, because they do not recall to the people the sacraments, which are the chief preservatives against moral corruption; *wanting*, because they rely on a cold, intellectual, and purely natural virtue.

Moreover, by the introduction of Protestantism, the lifeless forms of a spiritless worship succeeded a liturgy which had warmed and elevated the minds of the people; and in keeping with the soul of that worship were the white-washed dreary walls of such churches as were allowed to remain standing. The presence of the Life and Light of the world was withdrawn; the centre of Christian devotion, the sun that warmed and inflamed the breasts of men; what wonder if their souls were chilled and frozen, and their "tongues clove to their mouths," so that they could no longer utter songs of love and praise, or enter into the sublime worship paid by the Church to her Divine Spouse.

"Thus all things have combined [says Dr. Döllinger] to exclude the poor from the churches of England, or induce them voluntarily to keep away; the listless form of a service consisting almost wholly of readings; the space taken up by the pews of the rich; the feelings of the humbler as to the wretchedness of their attire by the side of the elegant costumes of the opulent, and then the widening separation and estrangement between these different classes The church is the house of the poor, in which, if it is anything more than a lecture-room, they feel themselves happy; for this reason, that they find there what is wanting in their confined and, mostly, cheerless homes—the adornment of pictures, symbols, ample space, the solemn influence of architectural beauty and proportion, tranquillity and silence inspiring devotion; an atmosphere and the example of prayer. Protestantism has not only robbed the churches it permitted to remain of every ornament, but it has locked and bolted them up, so that during the week no one can pay a visit to the church."¹

"It has been well said," writes Father Bridgett, "that throughout the Middle Ages works of art were to the people free as the light of heaven and loveliness of nature, to

¹ *The Church and the Churches.*

declare like them the glory of God, and excite the piety of His people."¹

Note also that "all the cheering and enlivening Church festivals that had been allowed to the people in Catholic times—processions, rustic fêtes, pilgrimages, dramatic representations and ceremonies—were, as a matter of course, abolished, and nothing remained but the sermon read out of a book, the liturgy[read out of a book]"—and with this the grim Calvinistic suppression of every social sport and every public amusement on the Sunday, "now transformed into a Jewish Sabbath." "Merry England" was dead!

Lastly, if there is one thing which the present incessant cries of distress and alarm prove beyond all dispute, it is this—that the poor law system of Protestant England is an egregious failure. Instead of that relief of Lazarus, which, as Father Gasquet well points out,² is prompted by the impulse of Catholic charity, is based on the commands of the Gospel, the examples of the Apostles, the teaching of the Christian Church, the instincts of humanity, and the universal practice of every civilized community—the English Dives has instituted a State-paid organization, with its awkward, blundering, imperfect, and expensive agencies "for executing a *portion* of those duties to society which flowed naturally and unobtrusively from the religious communities" that flourished in the land of Mary's dowry. "At the present day," says Leo XIII.,³ "there are many who, like the heathen of old, blame and condemn the Church—the common mother of rich and poor—for this beautiful charity"—"the heroism of charity, of religious orders, and other institutions which she has established for help and mercy." "They would substitute in its place," he continues, "a system of State-organized relief. But no human methods will ever supply for the devotion and self-sacrifice of Christian charity. Charity as a virtue belongs to the Church; for it is no virtue unless it is drawn from the Sacred

¹ *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, vol. ii., pp. 107, 108.

² *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, vol. ii., page 505.

³ *Rerum Novarum*.

Heart of Jesus Christ; and he who turns his back on the Church cannot be near to Christ."

The spoliation of the poor—*i.e.*, the violent or fraudulent robbery of "the patrimony which the Church has guarded with religious care as the inheritance of the poor"—was the necessary result of that first step towards the introduction of Protestantism into this country—the suppression of the monasteries. The transference of Church and monastic estates in wholesale parcels into the hands of laymen who cared more for the receipt of their rents, or else for the fattening of their beasts and the well-being of their horses, than for the old tenants of the abbey lands; the hurling of thousands of peasant proprietors and monastic dependents into helpless pauperism; the sudden stoppage of demand for the products of the trades and handicrafts nourished under the shadow of the monastery and the Church;¹ the conversion of large tracts of land, which hitherto had maintained a numerous agricultural population, into wild wastes of pasturage, so that at last "the sheep devoured men;" the appropriation by a grasping mushroom landlordism of the village commons and township lands, whereon the poor artisan might maintain his small live stock; the calling-in of all expenditure upon the poor—either by way of hospitality or relief—simultaneously with the marriage of the clergy and the enrichment of the nobility—such were the first beginnings of "Darkest England."

"But," says Father Gasquet,² "beyond this consumption by the 'classes' of the heritage of their poorer brethren at the time of the suppression, an additional and heavy wrong was done them by branding poverty with the mark of crime. To be poor was not before regarded as a reproach in itself, but rather upon every Christian principle poverty was held in honour." The Church has ever taught as Leo XIII. now teaches—and her action has been in accord with her teaching—"that in God's sight poverty is no disgrace, and that there is nothing to be ashamed of in seeking one's bread by labour."

¹ Father Bridgett, as above, vol. ii.

² *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, as above.

“Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed; He lovingly invites those in labour and grief to come to Him for solace; and He displays the tenderest charity to the lowly and the oppressed. . . . Thus the separation which pride would make tends to disappear, nor will it be difficult to make rich and poor join hands in friendly concord.” Such, however, were not the ideas realized by Protestantism either at its dawn or at any point in its course. “To Henry VIII.,” continues Fr. Gasquet, “belongs the singular distinction . . . of having invented literally, no less than figuratively, ‘the badge of poverty,’ and of being the first to dress a ‘pauper’ in a ‘pauper’s’ dress. It may fairly be doubted whether any single act of monarch or statesman ever did so much to vulgarize the character of an entire nation as Henry’s, when he bestowed ninepence a-week on each of thirteen poor men, hitherto supported by the monks of Gloucester, on condition that their caps and cloaks should bear a badge emblazoned with a token of the royal munificence.” What Henry initiated, Edward and Elizabeth continued and perfected. The very first steps taken by Edward’s Government to introduce Calvinism into the land was to establish by law (1548) a regular state of slavery. “Then those who had seized the inheritance proclaimed the poverty of those they had robbed a crime. Merciless and monstrous statutes enacted by the spoliators was the remedy by which it was sought to reduce the disease (*i. e.*, poverty and consequent degradation), and the rulers of the State did not shrink from introducing slavery, and inflicting even death for the *crime* of poverty, of which they had been the patent origin.” “Under Elizabeth,” writes Dr. Döllinger, “these laws were renewed, and even boys of fourteen or fifteen years old were to be branded if they begged for alms. If they were beyond eighteen, they might, on being arrested for a second time, be put to death. In the year 1597, severe whipping or condemnation to the galleys was substituted for branding.” “At the same time, the burden of the poor rates was first imposed, by which free Christian charity was degraded into a legal obligation, and a compulsory oppressive tax substituted for a willing gift.” And what is it we have set up, by means

of this enforced charity, to take the place of the monastic system? The workhouses! by which, as Dr. Döllinger remarked, this much is attained, that the working classes will endure the greatest privation, and live in the most disgusting filth, rather than go voluntarily into "the house!" Mr. Ruskin's words in this connection are scathing, indeed; and not less just, when we think of modern Anglicanism, which, by aping and by veering, tries to cover over its ugly breach of continuity with the past, and to escape from the consequences of the misdeeds of its founders. "The dramatic Christianity of the organ and the aisle, of dawn-service and twilight revival. . . . we are triumphant in, and draw back the hem of our robes from the touch of the heretics who dispute it. But to do a piece of common Christian righteousness in a plain English word or deed; *to make Christian law any rule of life, and found one national act or hope thereon*—we know too well what our faith comes to for that! You might sooner get lightning 'out of incense smoke than true action or passion out of your modern English religion. You had better get rid of the smoke and the organ-pipes both; leave them and the Gothic windows and the painted glass to the property man; give up your carburetted hydrogen ghost in one healthy expiration, and look after Lazarus at the door-step." "It is the Reformation, as it is now acknowledged," concludes Dr. Döllinger, "that has brought upon the English people, as its permanent consequence, a legally existing and officially established pauperism."

Where, then, is the change of front in the action of the Church? She has ever been, in heart and action, what she was when it was said of her children, "How these Christians love one another!" she has ever made it her aim to cement the brotherhood of man, and her very name connotes liberty, fraternity, and equality—yes, even the liberty, fraternity, and equality "of the sons of God and the co-heirs of Christ;" she has ever sought to sustain and elevate the poor and ignorant; she has ever relieved and consoled the suffering and oppressed; she has ever defended the rights and dignity of labour; she has ever jealously guarded and sanctified domestic happiness by preserving through persecution unto

blood the sacred character of marriage and the rights of the family; in short, she has ever aided and directed the struggling onward march of humanity; "and unto the poor the Gospel hath been preached." On the other hand, it was the Reformation, it was Protestantism, that created the present chasm between the "classes" and the "masses"; it was the Reformation that degraded the "masses," by trampling them under foot, and depriving them of all the elevating influences which tend to comfort and ennoble the fallen race of man. The conclusion, therefore, remains, that as the disease entered into the body of society by a departure from the principles and policy of Catholicism, the remedy must be sought by a return to the same: "if society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured, but by a return to the Christian life and the Christian institutions" of the Catholic Church. *Declinare ab instituto corruptio est: ad institutum redire sanatio.*¹

A. HINSLEY, B.A.

WHY AND HOW THE IRISH LANGUAGE IS TO BE PRESERVED.

AT the recent Catholic Congress at Malines, held to promote the interests of the Catholic religion, one of the subjects on which the delegates were addressed was the preservation, cultivation, and extension of the Flemish language. At a public meeting, held in connection with the congress, the people were addressed in Flemish by a cardinal archbishop, and by a number of distinguished ecclesiastics and laymen. Now, the position of the Flemish language at present is much the same as the position of the Irish. Neither of them is "the language of court or bar or business." As English has threatened to extinguish Irish, so French has threatened to extinguish Flemish. As a minority language, Flemish must be in a much worse position than Irish; while Irish, too, has a tremendous geographical advantage. If the Catholic clergy and laity of the Low

¹ Cf. *Rerum Novarum*.

Countries, in council assembled, adopt the cause of their mother-tongue on national and patriotic grounds, why should not the not less patriotic clergy of Ireland do likewise?

To one even partially conversant with the facts of the case, it must seem a truism to say that the future of the Irish language is almost wholly in the hands of the Irish clergy. To none can this fact be more evident than—if they consider it—to the clergy themselves. It is not only that the entire body of the clergy have the power of causing the Irish language to flourish or languish or perish all over Ireland, but each individual priest within the limits of his charge, if it includes a number of Irish-speaking people, has a large share of that power. There is no other body, and there are no other individuals, in possession of any such influence. Those who are placed in such a position of power with regard to any important intellectual and social element, such as a language and a literature must always be, must feel that upon them rests the responsibility of deciding what is the use to be made of their position. It is the privilege of the writer to place before the Irish clergy, through an exceptionally favourable medium, a few considerations embodying a portion of the views of a large number of thinking Irishmen, and concerning an object instinctively dear to the hearts of the whole people.

In considering the propriety of any course of public conduct, it will be of great use, and will furnish a criterion of unequalled justice and clearness, if we endeavour to realize how our action will appear in the light of history and in the eyes of posterity. Submitting the question of the Irish language to this test, we ask ourselves, if we permit the Irish language in this generation to be extinguished, or to be weakened beyond hope of recovery, what will the Irishmen who come after us think of us? Perhaps we may infer the answer from the spirit of Ireland beyond the seas. In America, Australia, and even England, we find Irishmen, under the impulse of something akin to the pain of loss, turning lovingly and earnestly to the cultivation of their mother-tongue; while those at home, who enjoy every opportunity, seem to lie under a spell of impenetrable apathy—the

better their opportunities, in fact, the greater their apathy. So, in America, our countrymen have societies, and classes, and periodicals devoted to the culture of Irish, whereas we in Ireland cannot decently support a quarterly journal devoted to the same purpose. Of the thousands upon thousands of Irish books published within the last generation, a fraction only remains in Ireland: the rest has been exported to satisfy the still unsatisfied demand of greater Ireland. It cannot then be deemed an exaggeration to say that if it were possible that any body of Irishmen, through their action or inaction, should cause the national speech to pass into the list of dead languages, they would forfeit the esteem and affection of posterity. We will not contemplate such a possibility. Let us prefer to believe that the cause of inaction is only a hope for better times, and that there is still the will to act, when an easier way is found. It is well to hope, but foolish to wait for realization, and it is not a prudent course to make the will subservient to the way.

The duty of the moment is, therefore, immediate action, energetic action, united action, individual action. I do not fear to call it a duty; nor do I deem it necessary to argue the grounds of its obligation, at least with Irishmen. Other nations do not stop to bandy dialectics over questions in which the national instinct points the way; and when I find Irishmen fencing over this question, it seems to me that their real reason is mere *ignavia*—a kind of selfish, courageless, apathetic, unsacrificing sloth. With such men, it is in vain to argue. On no social or mental question is it possible to reason to demonstration, and nothing short of a syllogism will suffice. The only really effective argument is action and example.

On the clergy, however, the Irish language has some special claims that appeal to them over the heads of ordinary Irishmen, and for this reason they are open to a special appeal, such as I am permitted to make.

First, as has been said, and must be admitted, they alone practically can carry out what the laity can only aspire to, or but weakly and partially effect. The laity who commonly speak Irish, are powerless to this end. The students of Irish

are usually men of little means and much work. The leisured classes do nothing, and nothing is expected of them. Once, then, that the duty of preserving and cultivating the language is recognised, its obligation must be seen to affect those most that have most power and best opportunities towards its fulfilment.

In the next place, the whole control of the education—primary, intermediate, and advanced—of Celtic Ireland is in the hands of the clergy. Hitherto, every opportunity to serve the Irish language by means of education has been neglected; while Welshmen, by the same means, have permanently established their national speech.

To the priesthood, as the moral guides of the people, apart from their position of ordinary influence, the Irish language can justly commend itself. The mass of Irish classical literature is the work of ecclesiastics. The first connection of the Church with Irish literature was, as antiquaries sadly realize, to free it, as far as possible, from everything that might link the people with their pagan past, and to make it the vehicle of Christian ideas. That literary revolution, once accomplished, was followed up with perseverance and success; so that writer and cleric became in Ireland convertible terms. Bishops, abbots, priests, and friars, were the poets, romancists, historians, and divines of Ireland, the authors, compilers, and transcribers of the “countless multitudes of the books of Eire,” from the times of Patrick and Fiach and Colum Cille to the times of the Four Masters, Keating, and O’Gallagher. Though a great part of the priesthood have allowed their tradition to lapse, the succession cannot yet be said to be broken. Hence it appears that between the Irish priesthood and the Irish language there exists an ancient *ξενία*, or perennial bond of friendship, a tie as sacred as any that can hold between men and things. It assorts ill with the spirit of that historic connection to allow the Irish language, now undoubtedly a strong link with the Christian past, to get rusty, and ultimately to break altogether.

The destiny of Ireland in the future, as in the past, seems to be that of a teaching nation. As the overflow of population

carried other races over the globe, so the overflow of national mental and moral advance has sent, and, we believe, will again send, a stream of teachers and preachers from Ireland across the seas. But to ensure this result, among many other desirable results, it will clearly be necessary to preserve the national character from any considerable fusion or admixture with the character of another less mentally active, less self-sacrificing, and less morally zealous race. Such fusion would naturally have the effect of causing the characteristics of the more numerous and powerful element of the mixture to prevail; and, as in our case, when the disposition of the one people is as diametrically opposed as it can be to the disposition of the other, the character that prevails must almost extinguish the character that succumbs. The history of Roman Gaul is in many ways parallel to the hypothetical future history of Ireland as we are contemplating it. One of the main aims of Roman policy was, we are told, to extinguish the national language of the Gauls; the Romans, with their keen political insight, plainly discerning the importance of language as a political factor. With the loss of their language, the Gauls lost their nationality; with the loss of their nationality, they lost their national spirit and their other splendid characteristics; so that at the break up of the empire they were left nerveless, inert, helpless, at the mercy of their barbarian neighbours. We Irish have resisted fusion for seven centuries, with the result that we are still a living, energetic, self-reliant nation, and as capable of doing a nation's work as on the day that Strongbow first landed in Ireland. Fusion was prevented first by the difference of language and by physical resistance; afterwards by difference of language and religion; latterly by religion alone. Were this last difference removed, as it may yet be, most probably by our own influence, it is a mere illusion to hope that the national character could, without some other defence, withstand the forces of assimilation. Politics will not form such a defence, for politics follow the forces of the time. Physical hostility is not to be dreamt of. Clearly, unless the national character remains to attract the national aspirations and leaven the national life, Ireland must become a

mere geographical expression. To extinguish the Irish language is no longer, as it once was, an object of *positive* policy, and the advocacy or opposal of its claims is no longer an affair of politics. Nevertheless, it does not behove the Irish priesthood, by any attitude, active or passive, to be the effective instruments of a policy now, at least ostensibly, relegated with the penal laws to the barbarous past.

The moral tone in which Irish classical literature excels all literatures constitutes another claim of the Irish language on the Irish clergy. As the literature of Ireland must long remain in their hands, it will be in their power to keep it free from the irreligion and immorality and folly that pervade other modern literatures; and not least among them English literature. Men rarely take up a newspaper or a periodical now-a-days in which there is not something that they would shrink from placing before the eyes of their families. Three-fourths of the books that issue from printing-presses are either dangerous to faith or morals, or at least calculated to develop a heated and diseased imagination at the expense of the will and understanding; for the average books of fiction, which the publishers' advertisements show to be in excess of all other publications, are of that character. The craving for these is becoming daily a more common disease, and daily creeping more among the lower and wider strata of society. For all this, the advocate of the Irish language has to offer a literature healthy as mountain air in the past, and capable of being preserved so in the future.

Should the Irish language be wholly supplanted by English, it has not been shown that any advantages, material or otherwise, would accrue to those who now speak it; for the simple reason that none can accrue. All they want with English at present is, either to seem what they have come falsely to regard as educated, or to be able to emigrate. Ask them, and they will tell you so. It is not to enable themselves to buy or sell, or perform their daily callings, that they desire to know English. Were they even a little instructed in their own tongue, they would never know the loss of English, and I go on the supposition that they should be and shall yet be so instructed. This unreasoning fear

about material prosperity is, perhaps, one of the strongest allies—stronger because not hitherto firmly faced—of this last century's mournful apathy.

But it is daily becoming more unjust to complain of apathy on this head, especially as regards the clergy. While the priesthood of America, of France, of Germany, and of other countries, are yearly developing stronger national proclivities, recognising that duty does not forbid them to identify themselves with their peoples, the priesthood of Ireland are not likely to be behindhand. So, they are coming to recognise that the Irish language plays no small part in the Irishman's reveries, and they are in ever-increasing numbers endeavouring to make of those dreams a reality. The day of cosmopolitanism, as opposed to patriotism, is gone; for it is seen to be as unnatural to peoples as communism is to individuals. That sentiment was never at home among Irish priests. Their patriotism is undoubted. And of all the phases of patriotism, they can perceive that the advocacy of the national language is the purest and most remote from any possibility of misdirection. Since the movement in favour of the Irish language first took shape, the names of bishops and priests have been at the head of it. At the present time, the most earnest workers in the movement are ecclesiastics. Numbers of the clergy who are engaged in the work of education are now turning their attention for the first time to Irish. This is especially the case in Dublin. The poet's prediction—

“Beidh an Ghaedhealg fá mheas mhór
I n-Atheliath na bh-fleasg bh-fíonól”—

is nearing its fulfilment.

It is remarkable that, in general, those who have known Irish from infancy are less enthusiastic in the cause than those who have had to labour for its attainment. The reason probably is, that in their infancy Irish was a thing despised. “You see,” said a good speaker of Irish to the writer, “we find it hard to feel any enthusiasm about the language that the little children talk.” This would be a very good reason why all Englishmen should cultivate

Dutch, or all Frenchmen German, to the exclusion of their native tongue. Such a ridiculous idea is unworthy of intelligent men. Let us hope that the West will no longer allow the East to take the lead in this movement.

Among many omens of good fortune for the Irish language, the clearest is the restoration of the Chair of Celtic in Maynooth. Father O'Growney has a great work before him. Fortified with an ample knowledge of Gaelic, new and old, and acquainted with the wide range of Irish speech and literature, availing himself of the fruits of the labours of native and foreign genius, and able to demonstrate the high value as a mental exercise of Celtic studies, he will be in a position to undo, in a great degree, the evils of the past, and to inspire the future guardians of the Irish tongue with a worthy purpose and ideal. And when the diocesan colleges fall into line, and send up their *alumni* already primed with Irish lore to Maynooth, the importance of the Irish professorship there will be immensely increased. It is but natural to hope that this step will be followed by the institution of Irish classes in those Catholic colleges where at present unhappily there are none.

Should these hopes be fulfilled, there can be no fear for the future of Irish. The people, even those who have lost the use of Irish generations ago, have a strong natural love for their native tongue, and the influence of the cultivation of Irish by those in higher station is certain to have as great an effect for good with them, as the past neglect on the part of the same class has had for evil.

The scarcity of really good Irish educational books—texts, grammars, phrase-books, dictionaries, and “methods”—affords good ground at present for complaint. But it is well-known that now-a-days, both in quantity and quality, the supply of educational works follows almost immediately the demand. Another great drawback at present is that in the schools, high and low, Irish is not a “paying subject.” For this the educationalists who do not teach Irish, and the parents who do not demand for their children instruction in Irish, are themselves to blame. Before a proper demand, backed up by the living facts, the most reactionary Board or Senate

could not refuse for a single year to place the Irish language on a "paying" footing. These are questions that should recommend themselves to the Catholic headmasters, and to the Irish public in general.

There is one other direction in which it is easy to strike a good blow for Irish. Every society of young Irishmen should be induced to establish an Irish class for its members; and the young men's clubs in Gaelic-speaking parts should be induced to conduct their deliberations in the native vernacular. If the "young men of Ireland" could be got to take these steps, they would have done something to show that they are more than mere lip-Irishmen. It will not do for those of us who unhappily have not been born to the use of our mother-tongue to excuse ourselves from all share in the work of preserving and cultivating it. If we have the opportunity, we should avail of it to learn Irish; for, as Father Donlevy quaintly but truly wrote, "Irishmen without Irish is an incongruity and a great bull." If we cannot learn Irish, we can at least stand up for it.

Two extremes the student and the teacher of Irish should avoid—submersion in the depths of philology and stranding on the muddy shallows of colloquialism. Some students of Irish tend to undervalue the modern idiom, because, forsooth, it is not so "Indo-European" as the Old Irish. Others again, through ignorance, substitute colloquial usage for the correct historical principles of grammar; and not a few are fond of setting up the usage and pronunciation of their own locality against reason, grammar, authority, and general observance. It is such men that have made the cheaply-earned name of "Irish scholar" a title without honour, and a distinction almost to be avoided.

The time is critical. The language may reach a certain stage of decay that may cut it off from all its past, or may suffer a diminution in the numbers of those who speak it that may make restoration almost impossible. If there is cause for congratulation, there is also cause for apprehension. Politics are now all-absorbing, and there is no greater enemy of the Irish language than the Irish politician, of whatever section. Every piece of special legislation

affecting the Irish-speaking districts of Ireland is like a fall of rain on a badly-roofed dwelling. If the house be put in order there will be nothing to fear from the rain. Those who have already been workers in the movement should exert themselves still more, and the apathetic should at last bestir themselves. The advantages of the time should be availed of, and its dangers guarded against. If the Irish clergy step into their rightful place, they will assure the success of the Gaelic movement, and add one more to their claims on the affection of their countrymen.¹

J. McNEILL.

A CHAPTER TOWARDS A LIFE OF THE LATE REV. JOSEPH MULLOOLY, O.P.²

ON Tuesday, the 11th day of February, 1890, the sale of the extensive and valuable library of the late Right Rev. Monsignor Neville, Dean of Cork, was commenced at the right rev. gentleman's late residence, 32, South Terrace, Cork. As might have been anticipated from Monsignor Neville's exalted position, high scholastic attainments, extensive knowledge, and close connection with the highest educational institutions in the country, his library embraced a fine collection of works on various subjects, many of the volumes being of great rarity.

¹ On consideration, it has occurred to the writer that possibly the forms of expression adopted by him in some instances might justly give ground for complaint on the part of readers. He wishes to disclaim any intention of being censorious, or of lecturing any of those to whom he addresses himself. He recognises that he has no title to act as censor or adviser, and therefore desires the views he puts forward to be considered on their own merits. When he speaks of responsibility, duty, apathy, of "should" and "should not," the force of the words but represents the force of the convictions which he shares with many respected Irishmen, both clergy and laity.

² By "A. H.," Priest of the Diocese of Dromore, with some Notes and Observations, and interesting information collected, relative to both rev. gentlemen

Among a number of books that I purchased at the sale, there was one of more than passing interest. It was a copy of Father Mullooly's great work, *Saint Clement, Pope and Martyr, and his Basilica in Rome*. The first edition of this work was published by Benedict Guerra, Plaza del Oratorio di S. Marcella 50, Rome, 1869; and the second edition, enlarged and improved, was printed in Rome, by G. Barbèra, in 1873. It is much to be regretted that no edition of this rare and interesting work—valuable alike to the artist and theologian, the archæologist and historian—has yet been brought out in Ireland. The copy that I was so fortunate in obtaining is of the second edition, and, besides the general additions by the author, it is largely interspersed with notes in manuscript, carefully written, and marked to correspond with the various subjects to which they relate. It contains, also, a number of plates and woodcuts, evidently not available when the volume was being prepared for the press; and, therefore, not to be found in any other copy of the work. From the careful manner in which the notes are arranged, and the plates inserted, I am of opinion that the volume was specially prepared with a view to bringing out a new edition.

But above and before all the additions that have been made to it, there is one that is deserving of notice, and will be the more interesting as it has never appeared in print. Bound into the volume, towards the end, are some half-dozen pages of manuscript—a sketch of the life of Father Mullooly; at the top of which, on the first page, is a very good photograph of the rev. gentleman, underneath which is written, “Rev. Joseph Mullooly, 14th August, 1878.” This sketch I consider too valuable a contribution towards the life of this talented, devoted, and eminent priest, to be put away unnoticed, or, perhaps, to be lost; especially as the priestly hand that penned it, is now, as well as poor Father Mullooly, mouldering into dust. Here, then, is a faithful transcript of the sketch, which some biographer may yet find useful towards compiling a life of the humble friar who has done so much to develop and illustrate our early Catholic ecclesiology; and who, though labouring, living,

and dying, far from his native land, brought credit alike to his creed and country :—

“ Joseph Mullooly was the son of a small farmer in Ireland, whose white head a priest told me was always in his place at church.

“ He sent his son to Rome with half-a-crown in his pocket. It was my good fortune to know this Dominican from 1852, and to witness his discoveries at St. Clemente from the first down to the Mithræum. Once he told me he should like to revisit Ireland, to see his father's grave. In 1879 he wrote to me that the Feast of Our Lady's Nativity was dear to him ; on that day, thirty-eight years, he took the habit, and a year after, solemn vows ; and for many years he had the care of St. Clemente, and St. Domenico and Sisto.

“ He was most assiduous in preserving the monuments of both churches ; and what I consider an unknown, almost, and very remarkable part of his character, was the patient personal toil with which he gathered up the poor conventual resources, husbanded them, and cultivated the vineyards mentioned in the Introduction.¹ On the round sepulchral tower there the Piedmontese brigands planted their cannon, and two children were killed opposite St. Clemente.

Patient, humble, laborious, sagacious, and very persevering he was the most disinterested, generous, and forgiving man I ever knew. I never saw him angry. His favourite maxim was that of imitation, ‘Of two evils we must choose the least.’ Pius IX. said : ‘Here is our prior, we must do what we can for him, for he knows how to take a rough word from the Vicar of Christ.’ And well did he deserve the words of Leo XIII., which filled him with confusion : ‘This is that friar of St. Clemente of whom we have heard so much good, so many encomiums’ He and St. Clemente had not been absent from the Pope's escape to Gaeta. He knew the Italians well ; their bloodthirsty passions ; the defects of police, the absurd lenity of the government ; but he also knew the pacific virtues of the good and religious-minded. He had a Catholic soul, full of reverence for the Sovereign Pontiff, full of submission in trials to the will of God. When a Roman paper attributed the discovery of the old Basilica to an Italian archæological prelate, and refused to correct the mis-statement, he felt hurt certainly, but showed no spleen. For he was only a friar, minding the things committed to his charge, desirous of the glory of Holy Church. To me it was wonderful and providential how such a quiet retiring man, when the archæological commission ceased the excava-

¹ The Introduction to *St. Clement, Pope and Martyr, and his Basilica in Rome*, is here meant.—C. G. D.

tions, had the courage to appeal to all Europe for subscriptions, and carried on the work himself alone.

"I think it was in 1856, the prior showed me in the convent cellar an antique Corinthian capital resting on the floor, the arch springing from it to support the roof. 'Do you think there is a column under it?' Old fragments were so commonly used in Rome, who could tell. Soon afterwards he told me there was a column, and in 1857 he took me down, and showed me, through a hole in the wall, a rude fresco of St. Catherine (page 187), and several pillars erect, about two-thirds buried in the earth.

"This discovery he communicated to De Rossi and other members of Pio Nono's archæological commission. In consequence, they undertook excavations, for the prior had no funds. I presume De Rossi alludes to this when he says (*Bullettino di Archæologia Christiana*, No. iv., 1870):—'In the year 1858 I opened by superior order an excavation behind the apse of the present Basilica of St. Clemente.' From whatever cause these excavations at the public cost ceased; and the prior, by begging, continued his own plans, ending with the finding of the MITHRÆUM. That also I saw before I left Rome, in 1870, when it was yet filled up almost to the roof; and the natural question was, 'Is this St. Clement's own oratory?' In *Bullettino* No. iii., 1870, De Rossi says:—'P. Mullooly has made a discovery quite unexpected and of the greatest value, by the ancient Basilica of St. Clemente, whose foundations and vaults in the lowest bowels of the earth, under the heavy mass of two buildings set upon them, he is exploring and excavating with an alacrity and firmness of wise purpose equal to the arduous undertaking.' In the next number (iv., 1870) De Rossi says again:—'In what other place of Rome or of Europe can the archæologist admire and study such a succession of architectonic monumental strata, which from our age go up in order of time, and in the depths of the earth go down by steps through more than twenty centuries? Setting aside the East and Egypt, I do not remember another group of ancient edifices, constructed one upon the other, to be compared with that which in the ravine between the Esquiline and Cælian is being revealed to us; thanks to the fifteen years' unwearied work of the well-deserving Irish Dominican.'

"And I, humble witness to truth, know from years of conversation with him, that not only this, but much more in that region would have been unearthed had he the power. For it must be remembered that one of the greatest difficulties was that the garden ground at St. Clemente was very confined, and it was necessary to burrow under the neighbouring lands. At page 135 De Rossi says:—'What almost goes beyond all our imagination is, that the whole of such a grand Basilica should have wholly disappeared under heaps of rubbish and ruins, so that the learned in Roman antiquity had neither sniff nor suspicion of its existence.'

All this reminds me of Columbus and the egg. The above-ground Basilica, as it came into Father Mullooly's hands, was puffed up as the ancient one.

"De Rossi says, indeed (page 142), that 'Pauvinus, who never had a suspicion of a Basilica buried in the foundations of the present one, yet knew that this was not the ancient church of the age of Constantine, but a work entirely re-made in the twelfth century by Cardinal Anastasius, of whom he wrote; his sepulchre is still extant in the Basilica of St. Clement, which he restored from its foundations—a *fundamentis refecit*.'

"To me it does not seem that Pauvinus even hints at an older church, because a thorough restoration from bottom to top may well take place in any pre-existing building. The jealous arrogance of Roman antiquaries is notorious.

"But the fact still remains that with all the old marbles and inscriptions of St. Clemente before their eyes, not one of them had a 'sniff or suspicion' of the existence of another Basilica till Joseph Mullooly, 'the well-deserving Irish Dominican,' enabled them to see.

"Methinks I find an explanation at page 152. 'Mistress of useful teaching is such a stupendous monumental strata *in our classic soil*. If the archæologists had studied the levels of the Roman monuments in the Cælimontan region they would have, *a priori*, and before any excavation, guessed that the present Church of St. Clemente is not, and could not be, one of the oldest in Rome, and that beneath it must be buried at least the vestiges of the primitive Basilica.' But the olden archæologists were too busy rubbing their noses against dug up coins and bits of pagan epitaphs, and rare statues of their classic soil. They seemed to fancy that none but a Roman could read Latin. And if by chance one or two, like Ciampini, wished to trace church forms in stone, it is quite certain that he engraved the Ambones and other *memorabilia* of this very recent Church of St. Clemente without an idea that they were not primitive uses in their primitive place. Why archæologists did not take levels *chi lo sa!* But I rather think that De Rossi himself, until he was shown the half-buried pillars and the fresco of St. Catherine, knew no more than they. What I do know is, that the unpretending Joseph Mullooly rose neither to the level of an archæologist nor man of letters, nor antiquary, nor finder of relics, nor connoisseur and dealer in Roman antiquities. Plenty such there were, and by no means small their profit and public praise. When he did discover, and when he went on discovering after others had abandoned the lead, certainly there was some vexation of spirit. He did not hold forth at any *accademia*. Only he went on digging, and 'the fifteen years' work of the well-deserving Irish Dominican' he illustrated by the book in which I am writing.

“Generally speaking, archæologists had their libraries and leisure. He had to grow the convent greens, to pay the vineyard, sell the best of its wines, and keep out fever by the worst left. He had to learn, and read up, and write, when and as best he could. And if he had done nothing else, but only printed his book on the labours of others, liable as a self-taught man must be to make mistakes, it would be a worthy work. But, to my mind, in this age of Rénans, Max Müllers, Huxleys, prattles about St. Paul’s rheumatics, jade and stone, rubbed-off monkey tails, ice-scratched rocks, it is as while noble lords travesty breviaries and note ‘legends,’ by the industry of a simple friar Providence has chosen to show Catholics where all this patter began, and where it ends.

“The strata of faith and discipline rise hard by the dens of vicious superstition.

“Still they rise, and if for a time they are buried by the wrecks of war and revolution, at an opportune time they are seen again. ‘Mistress of useful teaching,’ truly Rome still teaches the chosen Christian nation and royal priesthood—teaches and warns by over twenty centuries.

“A. H., Priest of the Diocese of Dromore.

“P.S.—The Piedmontese thieves and assassins deprived Father Mullooly of the Convent of St. Domenico e Sisto. In the church he had preserved many gravestones of Irish worthies. The chapter-house was painted by Père Besson, O.P.; chiefly miracles of St. Dominick connected with the building; among them that of Napoleon, Cardinal Stefano’s nephew. He had to buy in the vineyard of St. Clemente. He had added to the attractions of Rome one of the most interesting and popular monuments of Christian history, eagerly visited by people of every nation. In spite of the disastrous spoliation of Rome, he took care every year to celebrate St. Clement’s Feast with pious pomp, and illuminated the subterranean antiquities. What help had he? Not a lira from the brigands, who, egged on by the English Government, usurped Rome, and robbed the Catholic world. They new-entitled, for their own ends, the Commission of Christian archæology instituted by Pius IX., ‘another Damasus,’ as the flatterer styled him, and Roman archæologists did not blush to serve under them.

“On the 20th of June, 1880, Father Mullooly said his last mass in the novitiate chapel. He had suffered from pleurisy, but was supposed well enough to leave Rome for the summer. A true monk, he hated leaving his convent even for a night. After mass his strength failed; he never left his bed again, and died at the Ave Maria (Vespers of St. John and Paul), the General F. Larroca reciting the prayers for the agonizing. Like Pius IX.,

whom he loved so well, he is buried in the public cemetery of St. Lorenzo outside the walls. R.I.P.

“PP.S.—Joseph Mullooly, died Friday, 25th June, 1880, ten years after Rome was desecrated by the Piedmontese, Victor Emmanuel, and the intrusion of the English ambassador. Friendship may apply to a friar so known and so esteemed the *Magnificat* antiphon of the first vespers (26th the Feast) of the Martyrs, SS. John and Paul in their house, now the Passionist Church hard by:—

“Astiterunt iusti ante Dominum et ab invicem non sunt separati; calicem Domini biberunt et amici Dei appellati sunt.”

Curious to learn who the writer of this interesting sketch could be, I made inquiries among people most likely to be well informed in such matters, but with little result towards obtaining the desired information. “A. H., Priest of the Diocese of Dromore,” was totally unknown to them, under this designation.

It then occurred to me, that the writer, who showed such an intimate knowledge of the Rev. Father Mullooly, and so tersely described those prominent incidents of his life and labours, should be almost a permanent resident in the Eternal City, if not a constant companion of the estimable friar himself. But this opened up a new difficulty. I was not sufficiently acquainted with any individual in Rome, to trouble him to make the inquiry for me; yet I thought that the value of the sketch would be greatly enhanced by the discovery of its author. Looking through the *Irish Catholic Directory*, in the hope of alighting upon some name which the initials (A. H.) might even temporarily fit, I paused before the name of the Most Rev. T. A. O’Callaghan, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cork. Here, I said, is the source from which I may expect to obtain a thorough solution of the mystery. His Lordship, who has been for many years resident in Rome, and a close student of character and events connected with ecclesiastical matters in that city, is the most likely authority in the world on such a subject. Nor was I disappointed, as the sequel will show. I wrote to his Lordship, briefly detailing the circumstances which urged me to communicate with him, and requesting him to kindly give me any information that he could, respecting the signature,

“A. H., Priest of the Diocese of Dromore”—a copy of which I enclosed. His Lordship vouchsafed me this prompt, kind, and exceedingly valuable reply:—

“The initials, A. H., are evidently those of the Rev. Alexander Henry, an intimate friend of Father Mullooly for nearly forty years. His brother, Mitchell Henry, was at one time known in Irish politics. He was received into the Catholic Church early in life, and on the death of his wife was ordained priest, and accepted by the Most Rev. Dr. Leahy, Bishop of Dromore. He died more than a year ago,¹ at St. Leonards-on-Sea. . . . The Church of St. Clement is one of the most interesting monuments of Christianity, and I am delighted that you have come to know it.”

Here, then, is a flood of light thrown upon the subject, for which future biographers, as well as present readers, will feel deeply grateful to his Lordship. The Rev. Father Alexander Henry is the author of the sketch of Father Mullooly, and is also the author of the manuscript notes (which are in the same handwriting), and compiler of the extra plates and woodcuts inserted in the copy of that exceedingly interesting work of “the well-deserving Irish Dominican,” noticed at the beginning of this paper. Little wonder, indeed, that the “intimate friend for nearly forty years” of the dear departed friar should endeavour to snatch from the teeth of time those interesting events that he has so carefully and sympathetically recorded, in the life of a man, whose sanctity, labours, and name, are so little known to his countrymen at the present day. His Lordship most aptly designates the Church of St. Clement “one of the most interesting monuments of Christianity.” This it really is, if it is not absolutely *the most* interesting; for it opens to us the earliest plan, arrangement, and artistic treatment of Christian subjects of any Christian Church in the whole world. The labours of Father Mullooly, together with the history and illustrations contained in his book, I think, conclusively prove this.

But to turn to the Rev. Father Henry. I was anxious to learn a few additional facts about him—as from his

¹ His Lordship's letter bears date, 1st May, 1891.

writings I concluded that he was a man of talent, firmness, and fine feeling. I wrote to a revered friend of mine, a P.P. in the West of Ireland, on the subject; but the only information the rev. gentleman could give me was, that Father Henry was a gentleman of comparatively independent means. Another letter addressed, to an estimable clergyman in Dublin, brought me a reply, from which I take the following extract:—"Father Mullooly was born near Longford; went to Rome very young to join the Dominican Order; and never came to Ireland. Years ago he got votes for the Diocese of Ardagh. Father Henry was never a Dominican. The only person I know who could give you any information about him, is the Rev. Father H. O'N." To the Rev. H. O'N. I then wrote, explaining my object and introduction, and the rev. gentleman most kindly replied to my query, and I gratefully quote from his exceedingly valuable and interesting letter:—

"I fear I cannot give you much information regarding the matter in which you are interested. I knew Father Henry only through his acquaintanceship with our late¹ revered Bishop, Dr. Leahy. I know nothing at all about him which would connect him with Father Mullooly. His family, as I understand, originally came from the neighbourhood of Loughbrickland, a village some eight miles from Newry. But whether he was born there or not, I do not know.

"Dr. Leahy met him, I think, for the first time in the spring of 1864, in Rome—possibly through the introduction of Father Mullooly. He gave him one of the Holy Orders—sub-deaconship, I think. It was at that time he was accepted as a priest of the diocese of Dromore. This arrangement was merely one of convenience under the circumstances of his residence at that time in Rome. Ever after in his letters to Dr. Leahy he always subscribed himself 'your obedient subject.' He paid a visit to the bishop in Violet Hill in the summer of 1870, the year in which the Vatican Council opened. This reminds me of a little incident which illustrates a very marked feature in Father Henry's character. The bishop being a bad sailor would not go by way of Marseilles and Civita Vecchia, and proposed to go overland. Father Henry, on the other hand, with all his regard for the bishop, and all his desire to be his travelling companion, would not recognise the usurpation of Victor Emmanuel, even so far as to pass through

¹ The letter is dated, September 24th, 1891.

the country of which he had robbed the Holy Father. Each, therefore, took his own course, and arrived in Rome by different routes. The bishop, however, did not travel alone. The late Father Thomas Burke was his companion.

"After the Italian occupation of Rome, Father Henry settled down in England. He may have come sometimes to Ireland, to his brother's place at Kylemore; but he never, to my knowledge, revisited Violet Hill. He wrote, however, occasionally to the bishop. He was always certain to write for Christmas, Easter, and the bishop's feast day. His letters have not been preserved. I don't think, however, they were of any special value, containing merely little details of his life in St. Leonard's, or congratulations suited to the season and time they were written. He took a very warm interest in the Convent of the Poor Clares, Newry. While he was in Rome he made them a present of a magnificent shrine containing the relics of St. Leontie. Some years ago, when passing by Kylemore, his brother's residence, I heard a good deal about his kindness in many ways to the people of the district. His conversion, I believe, displeased his father very much, but did not seem, however, to have lessened the friendship of his brother Mitchell, or his sister, with whom he always continued on most affectionate terms. Like many other converts, he was very eager and zealous in the way of trying to bring others into the Church. Personally he was a man of genuine piety. I have just jotted down these odds and ends from memory. If they serve your purpose in any way, you are at liberty to use them."

Well, I have accepted the permission and used them; and I believe that I am correct in stating that everyone who reads them will feel grateful to the "memory" that preserved within its cells "odds and ends" that give so concisely the salient points in the life of this estimable clergyman.

But I have not done with Father Henry yet. I think that I can connect him with the authorship of *The Sceptic's Dream*, a most remarkable document, published in the second edition of Father Mullooly's work only in Rome. It has never been published in Ireland. In this document the sceptic gives a minute account of the almost miraculous circumstance that led to his conversion; and the whole associations, and particularly the pointed reference to St. Clement, taken together with the fact that typographical errors in the copy of the "Dream" that I possess are corrected by Father Henry, goes far to fix upon that rev.

gentleman the authorship. Even the heading composed by the Rev. Father Mullooly strongly supports this assumption. The extraordinary circumstance related in the document is so full of interest, and the document itself never having been submitted to Irish readers, will plead its apology for being reproduced here. Father Mullooly heads it thus:—

“An anonymous friend has sent us the following lines, which presuming on the writer’s permission, we insert here:—

“THE SCEPTIC’S DREAM.

“It was the festival of St. Clement. I was in Rome, and wandering with a friend among the stately ruins of the Colosseum. The gentle autumnal breeze brought to our ears the sound of distant church bells. ‘It is time to go to St. Clement’s,’ said my friend; ‘are you not coming with me?’ ‘No, thank you,’ I replied, ‘the church itself is interesting, I grant you, from its ancient architecture and frescoes; but as a work of art alone, at least to me, the legendary meanings of the paintings on its walls, are as mythical as the history of Romulus and Remus. No, I leave such puerilities to women and children.’ ‘I will not attempt to argue with you,’ was the answer; ‘but,’ opening his English prayer-book, ‘having seen you at the English service last Sunday, I fancied you might venerate a church in which the remains repose of a saint commemorated by our communion,’ and he pointed to a line in the Kalendar, marked “November 23rd, St. Clement, Bp. and Martyr.” ‘My dear fellow,’ I answered, ‘all communions are much the same to me. I went to Church last Sunday, because the rest of my party did so; but you must not take for granted, in consequence, that such is my habit. Christianity may have effected much; I do not say it has not; but civilization has done more, and we of the nineteenth century, the age of free thought, cannot again put ourselves in leading strings. Look at these piers; was this gigantic pile erected by Christians? After all, we are a set of pigmies compared to those whom you would term our less enlightened progenitors. The very stones of Rome have a voice.’ ‘Yes,’ he answered, ‘but, like the writing on Balthassar’s wall, there is only one true interpretation.’ So saying he left me, and sitting down upon a stone half worn away by the knees of pilgrims, I lazily watched the daws, and listened to their cawing, as they flew in and out the upper arches, until, overcome with drowsiness, I fell asleep, and dreamt.

“And this was my dream:—I dreamt that I was alone, pacing up and down one of the aisles in the Church of Clement, when suddenly I felt, without at first seeing anything, that some one was near me. I turned my head, and saw that close beside

stood a shadowy figure, whose features I could not distinctly discern, the whole form being enveloped in a kind of mist; but a voice, different from any I had ever known, fell on my ear. 'Even the stones of Rome speak,' it said; 'come with me, and I will tell you what they say.' An unseen power seemed to constrain me to follow my conductor, and I hastened after the shadowy form down the flights of steps which led to the subterranean church. 'You reject as false all you cannot see with your bodily eyes,' it said: 'is it not so? All unwritten tradition is the same to you—a collection of idle tales; and much even that you see you declare to be interpolated, if it does not exactly agree with your own ideas of what is reasonable. Am I not right?' I bowed my head in assent.

"You consider Romulus and Remus as mythical personages; you doubt whether such a patriot as Horatius Cocles ever existed, except in the poet's brain; but you believe, do you not, that there were such monarchs as Nero and Trajan?" I bowed again. 'Why do you believe in them? Perhaps they—perhaps none of the so-called Cæsars, ever really lived.' I murmured something about the testimony which not one but several histories gave to their existence, recording their deeds, entering into minute descriptions of their very character; also, that even the buildings in Rome added further confirmation. 'Yet you have allowed the doubt to enter into your mind whether Christianity itself is of divine origin, and you actually sneer at those who venerate with reverential affection the martyrs who won their crown by embracing death in its most terrible shapes rather than apostatize.' 'I never sneered at a martyr himself, in whatever cause,' I hastily answered; 'truth, self-devotion, self-denial, must always command respect.' 'Look on this then,' the figure replied; 'but first cast from your mind scepticism and frivolity, which, as poisonous exhalations, interpose between you and the truth. Here you see the installation of St. Clement, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul, as Bishop of Rome; here again he is celebrating the Holy Eucharist; see the altar, paten, chalice, the very words in the open book, the same as those used daily in the service of the Church. Will not what has been accepted *always* and *everywhere* have a little weight with you in helping to prove the truth of Christianity? You have seen these before; you have admired the depth of expression in the faces, the freshness of colouring, the grace of the drapery; but those they represented were to you as myths. Yet not in one, but in many books, these acts of the martyrs are recorded; and now these walls, decorated by the art of more than a thousand years ago, corroborate their testimony. You admire self-denial in the abstract; here you find it in reality. Here St. Alexis, leaving his bride and parents and affluence, goes forth to lead a life of self-abnegation, and putting his hand to the plough, until death, looks not back. Here

again you have the apostolic words fulfilled, and the unbelieving husband converted by the believing wife.

“Look down below into the chambers, turned by St. Clement into a retreat for prayer; he, the noble Roman, forsaking the gorgeousness of an imperial court, to labour with Paul the aged, one who wrought with his own hands for his living, and a prisoner. Is not that self-devotion? Walk round and round this ancient Basilica; you will find the same story on each fresco; all unite in silently but effectually preaching the same doctrine—death to the world, in order to attain to life in that which shall never pass away. Above us, but beneath the high altar, repose all that is mortal of St. Clement and St. Ignatius. Why were they martyrs? Because they loved the truth better than their lives. Because the ancient Romans, the conquerors of the world, delighted to see an aged man against whom not a whisper of slander could be breathed, torn to pieces by wild beasts, or as he himself expressed it, ‘I am the wheat of Christ. I must, therefore, be ground and broken by the teeth of wild beasts, that I may become his pure and spotless bread.’ A few years ago, and those blessed relics were borne in triumph through the arena, once flowing with his blood, and the stones which echoed to ‘Death to the Christians!’ resounded to the glorious *Te Deum*. What has effected this change from bloodshed to peace, from the cry of the heathen persecutor to the triumphant song of the Christian? Has civilization? No, a thousand times no. A fisherman of Galilee, a Jew of Tarsus, a few disciples, some of them weak women and striplings, have won a grander victory than ever did Alexander or Augustus. Rome conquered the world, but they conquered Rome. And your boasted reason, what does it say? Does it not bow to the Almighty power which alone could effect this marvellous change? Is not Christianity divine? Do not the very stones of Rome attest it? Do not the walls of San Clemente and of the Colosseum suffice alone, without any other proofs, to bear requisite testimony to the truth which the Church, watered by the blood of martyrs, teaches?

“Oh! wretched, miserable doubter, be sceptical no longer. You admire him who dies for a principle, however faulty; venerate those who looked for no applause of man, but an unfading wreath in heaven. You profess to love truth; think of those who sealed their testimony to it with their blood, sooner than throw a few grains of incense before an imperial image. You feel your heart glow within you while listening to the histories of Clement, and Cyril, and Alexis, and their patient self-denial. Waver then no more, unstable mortal. Learn from these old walls and decayed paintings the eternal truths they eloquently, though silently, proclaim: and years hence, may be, in your distant home, far away from this city of martyrs, you

will remember with thankfulness, as the feast of St. Clement comes round in the Church's year, the lesson they taught you. Yes, these very walls, hidden for centuries, have now, as it were, been brought to light to add yet a testimony to the awful fact, in this age of inconsistency and incredulity, fast gliding from the mind of man, that this sphere is not to revolve for ever; that a pagan morality is not sufficient to cleanse its corruption; that the most virtuous heathen that ever lived lacked that consoling faith in a communion of saints which sheds a soft benignant light on the dreariest path trod by a Christian, and so died as he lived, without that peace which the highest honours of earth fail to bestow.'

"The voice ceased, and I awoke. The sky was still a cloudless azure: the daws were still cawing above me; all around appeared the same. I alone was different, and as I walked from the great amphitheatre, I turned once more for a last look at the central cross, that holy symbol so dearly loved by the early Christians, that even on their very tiles they engraved it: and I felt that I too had been conquered by its power, on the spot where the martyrs won their crown."

C. G. DORAN.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

1. "LIBRARY OF AMERICAN LITERATURE." In eleven vols.
Edited by E. C. Stedman and E. M'Kay Hutchinson:
Chatto & Windus.
2. "AMERICAN LITERATURE." By John Nichol.
3. "POETS OF AMERICA." By E. C. Stedman.

THE passengers of *The Mayflower* made their new homes in a land without memories. Time had hallowed no mound by the Hudson or the Potomac; the shores of Erie or Ontario were not haunted by the gray legends of the old world; no dim traditions of great names, or mighty deeds, or dark tragedies clung to glen or hill. As they wandered over the vast spaces of the new continent, the Pilgrims' tread was on no empire's dust—no vision of buried greatness rose up before them—no voices called to them from storied urn or desecrated shrine—no gloomy fortress frowned upon

them, or whispered from its ivied desolation the stormy history of its ruin. They felt nothing of that indefinable charm that ever lingers where saintly men lived, or wise men taught, or brave men suffered. They saw none of those mouldering relics that kindle thought and waken far-reaching associations. Imagination wanted its enchanted atmosphere. There was no Marathon, no Camelot, no Iona. The inspiration of nature was, indeed, round them everywhere—the colour of Autumn woods—the purple of rolling prairies—the crimson of evening on the lakes—thundering cataracts—murmuring pines—moaning hemlocks; but, Puritanism had narrowed their sympathies, and the struggle for daily bread was unfavourable to the contemplative eye. Hence the growth of American literature was slow.

During the colonial period, John Smith, William Strachey, John Josselyn, William Wood, and John Mason, wrote some interesting and graphic prose sketches. One of Strachey's sketches, *The Wrack and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates*, is particularly noteworthy, as some eminent critics believe that from it Shakespeare borrowed the plot of his magic creation, *The Tempest*. But the bombastic verse of the Broadsheets, the Foglers, the Thomsons, and other whining bards, is long ago wisely forgotten.

Between the period we have spoken of and the period of the Revolution, Benjamin Franklin is the connecting link. Franklin was born at Boston, in 1706. In youth he was a candlemonger. About the age of twenty he became apprentice to a printer. But after a short time untiring industry made things brighter for him. In 1747 he commenced his *Poor Richard's Almanac*. Between the years 1747 and 1754 he wrote a series of letters on electricity. In 1779 he published his political and philosophical works. His countryman, Bancroft, well sums up his literary merits:¹ "He had not the imagination which inspires the bard or kindles the orator, but an exquisite propriety gave ease of expression and graceful simplicity to his most careless writings."

¹ See Bancroft, *History of America*, page 528.

The *Poor Richard's Almanac* is the American book of proverbs. It abounds in terse and wise sayings. "One to-day is worth two to-morrows." "If you would know *the value of money*, go and borrow some." "Industry need not wish, and he who lives upon hopes will die fasting." "Virtue is the best preservative of health." "If your desires are to things of this world, they are never to be satisfied." "Ambition has its disappointments to sour us, but never the good fortune to satisfy us."

A few of the leaders of the Revolution were men of considerable literary taste. Hamilton's *Historical Sketches* are pure in style and often original in thought; the speeches of Fisher Ames are looked upon by the Americans themselves as almost equal to Burke's; Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* contains not a few graphic passages.

The revolutionary poetry is very muddy stuff. Trumbull wrote a long epic, which, it is said, helped on the war; Dwight, a poetical prophecy on the coming greatness of his country; and Joseph Hopkinson, the now National Anthem *Hail Columbia*. Freneau is the only poet of the time whose verses are still read: his *Wild Honey Suckle*, has the freshness of one of Herrick's poems. From this poet Campbell¹ borrowed one of the most beautiful stanzas in *O'Connor's Child*, and the last lines of *Gertrude of Wyoming*. There is also an echo of him in some lines of *Marmion*:

Passing to free America the novelists first claim our attention. Charles Brockden Brown was the earliest fiction writer of note in the New World. In 1798 Brown published *Wieland*, which was soon followed by *Ormond*, *Arthur Merwyn*, and *Edgar Huntley*. These strange tales remind one of Godwin and Shelley; however, they contain many brilliant passages, and are, beyond doubt, the works of a man of high ability. Diana's *Tom Thornton* and *Paul Filton* are of the same class; and also Hoffman's *Ben Blower's Story*.

In the order of time the next American fiction writer is Washington Irving. Irving's style is highly finished and

¹ See Nichol, page 95.

graceful. His phrases are often graphic and generally rhythmical. He has neither the originality nor the colloquial ease of his model, Addison. But he has the rare art of combining humour and pathos. There are few sketches more pathetic than *The Broken Heart*, *The Widow's Son*, and *Rural Funerals*; while Knickerbocker's *History of New York* is a masterpiece of this author's genial humour. And whether his tale of *Rip Van Winkle* had been suggested by the story of *Thomas the Rhymer*, or the legend of *Peter Klaus*, or *The Sleep of Ossian*, the humour and local colouring are Irving's own. Nor will his name be forgotten among the maples and purple asters that clothe the sides of the Katerskill till Byron's is forgotten by misty Lochnavar. Yet a greater force in American literature than Irving was his contemporary, Fenimore Cooper.

Cooper transports us from the scenes of civilized life to the gloomy lakes and wild hunting-grounds of the savage. He makes us feel the deep stillness of the forest and the unbounded extent of the prairie. His descriptions of Indian life and scenery are unsurpassed; his sea pictures have the vastness and freshness of the sea. Like his great model, Scott, he seldom analyzes character, but gives us a man's portrait by his words and actions. Cooper's style has never the grace and harmony of Irving's. It is sometimes crude and slovenly, and often diffuse. Some of his plots, also, are loosely constructed and deficient in interest. His one great gift which time will not destroy, is "the power of breathing into his creations the breath of life, and turning the phantoms of his brain into seeming realities."¹

Passing from Cooper to Edgar Poe, is like leaving the fragrance of woods and meadows, and wandering among tombs and sunless ruins.

Poe was born at Boston, on 13th January, 1809. According to some of his biographers, the original name was Le Poer. The Le Poers were descended from a Norman knight, Roger Le Poer, to whom Henry II. granted the territory round Waterford. In Mr. Ingram's opinion, the author of *The*

¹ See Parkman's Essays, selected from *North American Review*.

Raven was descended from the Poes of Riverstown, Co. Tipperary. Be this as it may, at least we are certain that his great-grandfather left Ireland for America about 1760; that his grandfather rose to distinction in the United States army; and that his father became an actor. Two years after Edgar's birth, both his parents died. The orphan was adopted by John Allen, of Richmond; hence the name Edgar Allen Poe. In 1816, Mr. Allen visited England, and placed his adopted child at a school near London. "My earliest recollections of school life," says Edgar, "are connected with a large rambling Elizabethan house in a misty village of England, where were a vast number of gigantic and gnarled trees." To this earliest recollection of a hoary house and "deeply shadowed avenues" may be traced much of the gloom in Poe's writings. In 1821, he sailed for his native land, and the following year was sent to a classical school in Richmond, Virginia. Reminiscences of him during this period have been handed down by four or five of his fellow-pupils. He was slight in form, but well-made, sinewy and graceful, a swift runner, a wonderful leaper, a strong swimmer. His manners was courteous, his disposition amiable, his impulses generous though capricious; he was a fair French scholar, and very fond of the *Odes* of Horace. In 1826, he entered the University of Virginia. Here he took high honours in modern languages and the ancient classics. Here, too, unfortunately, he commenced his career of vice. Heavily in debt, he soon left the university, and the following year wandered, no one knows where. Some say he offered his services to the Greeks against the Turks; according to his own story, he spent the greater part of his time in France, where he wrote a novel. After eighteen months' absence, the prodigal returned. In 1830, he entered a military academy; but scarcely a year went by when he was brought before a court-martial, and dismissed the service of the United States. Homeless now and friendless, he turned to literature as a means of obtaining a livelihood. In 1833, he won two prizes, offered by the editor of a Richmond paper, for the best poem and the best story. This brought him under the notice of a Mr. Kennedy, who secured for him the editorship of *The Southern Literary*

Messenger. In the pages of this monthly, Poe began to publish his wonderful tales. There appeared:—*Bernice Morello*, *Hans Pfaale*, and the bitter criticisms which made so many enemies for their author. *Arthur Gordon Pim*, *Ligeia*, *William Wilson*, and *The Fall of the House of Usher*, were published in 1837. Four years later, Poe became editor of *Graham's Magazine*, and wrote for it *The Murder in the Rue Morgue*, *The Descent into the Maelstrom*, and a review of *Barnaby Rudge*, and of Longfellow's *Ballads*. In 1844 he obtained a prize of one hundred dollars for *The Golden Bug*; and on 29th January, 1845, appeared in *The Evening Mirror* his far-famed *Raven*. It has often been asked what suggested to Poe the composition of this very remarkable poem. Mr. Ingram thinks (and, in my opinion, thinks rightly) that the source of its inspiration is to be found in a poem of Albert Pike's, called *Isidore*, and published in 1843. In *The Raven*, too, are, doubtless, echoes of Mrs. Browning's *Lady Geraldine's Courtship*. But when all suggested sources have been "scrutinized,"¹ what a wealth of imagination and a power of words remain the unalienable property of Poe." The year before his death, this unhappy author lectured through the United States, and wrote *Annabel Lee* and *The Bells*. He died on 7th October, 1849.

Though not ungrateful and treacherous, as described by Griswold, Poe was, undoubtedly, a drunkard. This vice made his home cheerless, and left those dearest to him without bread. By it a rare and radiant intellect was darkened, and eyes that once glowed with expression sadly dimmed. Fortunately, there is no trace of his irregular life in his works. In his most degraded moments he was never tempted "to paint the mortal shame of nature with the living hues of art."

Another remarkable circumstance connected with one whose career was so unhappy—who sold *The Raven* for ten dollars, and offered *The Bells* for the price of a dinner and a pair of boots—is the extreme care he bestowed on his literary compositions. "Nothing that he put before the public," says

Mr. Ingram,¹ " save some of his earliest work, was published until he had given it the most elaborate polish it was capable of receiving. Word after word, sentence after sentence, was carefully considered, and its import weighed before it was placed in position." Hence, Poe is, beyond doubt, a great literary artist—except Hawthorne, the greatest America has produced. Perhaps he has not what Mr. Arnold calls a genius and instinct for style, as the author of *The Scarlet Letter* certainly had; but, as Lowell remarks, " his style is highly finished, graceful, and truly classical." He has force, clearness, and " a wealth of jewel-like words."² These qualities alone would long save his tales from the mildew and the canker-worm. Yet, these are not all: in *The Purloined Letter*, and *The Golden Bug*, we have an analytical power surpassed only by Balzac—in *Ligeia* and *The Fall of the House of Usher* we have the " grace and natural magic of the Celt;" in *Eleonore* and *Hans Pfaale*, the brilliancy of De Quincey. Nor are there in *The Confessions of an Opium Eater* any passages that surpass in sublime terror the second and twenty-first chapters of *Arthur Gordon Pym*; while the concluding chapter of the same tale is one of the most ghastly graphic bits of writing in all literature. On the other hand, what a vision of abiding loveliness the necromancer of the weird and the terrible calls up in *The Domain of Arnheim*. " Meanwhile, the whole paradise of Arnheim bursts upon the view. There is a gush of entrancing melody; there is an oppressive sense of strange sweet odour; there is a dream-like intermingling to the eye of tall slender Eastern trees, bosky shrubberies, flocks of golden and crimson birds, lily-fringed lakes; meadows of violets, tulips, poppies, hyacinths and tuberoses; long intertangled lines of silver streamlets; and, uprising confusedly from amid all, a mass of semi-Gothic, semi-Saracenic architecture, sustaining itself, as if by a miracle, in mid-air, glittering in the red sunlight with a hundred oriels, minarets, and pinnacles; and seeming the phantom handiwork conjointly of the sylphs, of the fairies, of the genii, and of the gnomes."

¹ See preface to Poe's Tales in Tauchnitz edition.

² See Lang's *Letters to Dead Authors*, page 149.

As a poet, Poe's range is very narrow. "He has no humour, no general sympathies, no dramatic power." His verse never palpitates with emotion, never rings with sounds of laughter and sunny life. Old-world memories are not woven into it, nor has he put into it the yearnings and throbbings of his own day. It is simply a wail of enchanted melody above a tomb; yet a wail, once heard, that ever haunts the memory. And, think as we may otherwise of such poems as *The Haunted Palace*, *The City in the Sea*, *The Sleeper*, *To Helen*—their delicate rhythm, their matchless music, their magic words, will ever secure for their author one of the highest places in the list of American poets.

T. LEE.

(*To be continued.*)

Liturgical Questions.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.—II.

THE GOLDEN NUMBER.

The Greeks, like the Romans, at first employed the lunar phases as their measure of time. The length of a lunation they had with considerable accuracy calculated to be on an average twenty-nine and a-half days, and their year consisted of twelve such lunations, or three hundred and fifty-four days. But Nature soon compelled the Greeks, as she did the Romans, to bring their year into some kind of harmony with the sun, and the system of intercalation adopted by them was substantially the same as that which we have seen employed by the Romans. Indeed, it is strongly suspected that the Romans, whose ignorance of astronomy was notorious, borrowed from the more civilized and more highly-gifted Greeks whatever scientific

accuracy their early calendar could boast of. The moon, however, still remained an important factor in the calendar of the Greeks. For from a very early period her various phases marked the dates of some of the chief festivals of the Grecian deities. And as these phases did not, as the year went round, fall on the same days of the months making up the solar year, it became a matter of great moment to find out beforehand, and to publish to the people, the precise days in each month on which these phases and their annexed festivals would fall. But for years priests and astronomers laboured in vain at this problem.

At length Meton, an Athenian astronomer, succeeded in solving it. He discovered that nineteen solar years are so nearly equal in length to a certain number of lunations—two hundred and thirty-five—that at the end of this period the new moons, and, consequently, all the lunar phases, occur on the same days on which they had occurred nineteen years previously. In other words, he discovered that in every nineteenth year the different lunar phases happen on the same days of the month. Hence it was only necessary to mark the dates of the new moons for one period of nineteen years in order to have a calendar that would serve for every succeeding period of the same number of years. Meton published his discovery at the Olympic games, celebrated at the beginning of the eighty-seventh Olympiad, or in the year 432 B.C., and was rewarded with the Olympic crown. And not satisfied with conferring this honour upon him, his fellow-citizens had the numbers expressing the dates of the new moons during an entire cycle engraved in golden letters on marble slabs, and laid up in the temples of the gods. From this circumstance the cycle of nineteen years came to be called the “Cycle of the Golden Number;” and the numbers one, two, three, . . . nineteen, were called the “Golden Numbers.” Hence the golden number of a particular year is that one of these numbers which indicates the order of the given year in the cycle of nineteen years. Thus the year having one as its golden number is the first of a cycle; that having two, is the second; and so on to the year whose golden number is nineteen, which is the last of the cycle.

The next year will then be the first of a new cycle, and have one for its golden number.

This cycle of golden numbers, or Metonic cycle, was first employed in determining the date of Easter by Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, in Syria, towards the close of the third century. And when the Council of Nice committed to the Patriarch of Alexandria the task of calculating the time for celebrating Easter each year, it was this cycle that was recommended and used for that purpose by the mathematicians of Alexandria. Meton, as we have seen, published his discovery in the year 432 B.C., and made this the first year of the cycle. Continuing a series of cycles from that date, we find that the year 1 A.D. should have been the fifteenth year of the current cycle; which, consequently, should have begun with the year 14 B.C. But in adopting the discovery of Meton for the purpose of determining the date of the Paschal celebrations, the Christian scientists did not adopt his point of departure, but selected instead the year immediately preceding the commencement of the Christian era. This year was selected for two reasons; first, because it was the year in which Christ was born—for the Christian era does not pretend to begin with the year of the Nativity, but with the year which begun on the 1st January, just one week after the day of the Nativity. The second and more scientific reason was, that in that year the new moon fell on the 1st January. Knowing now the year from which our present series of cycles of golden numbers begins, it is easy to find the golden number of any given year in the Christian era, past, present, or future. For since the year immediately preceding the year 1 A.D. was the first of a cycle, it follows that the year 1 A.D. itself was the second, the year 2 A.D. the third, and the year 18 A.D. the nineteenth, or last year of the first cycle. The first year of the second cycle was, therefore, 19 A.D.; the second year, 20 A.D.; and so on. Hence the general rule for finding the golden number of any year since the birth of Christ is to add one to the date of the particular year, and divide the sum by nineteen. The remainder is the golden number; and if there is no remainder the golden number is nineteen, or the year is the last of the

cycle. Thus we find that eleven is the golden number for the present year, 1891. For—

$$\frac{1891 + 1}{19} = 99 \frac{11}{19}$$

Therefore, the year 1891 is the eleventh year of the hundredth Metonic cycle, as this cycle has been employed in Christian times. The golden number for 1892 will, of course, be twelve; that for 1893, will be thirteen; and 1899 will be the last year of the current cycle.

The Metonic Cycle, as we have seen, was founded on the hypothesis that nineteen solar years and two hundred and thirty-five average lunations cover exactly the same interval of time. This hypothesis, though not absolutely correct, was still wonderfully near the truth, and gives evidence of the surprising accuracy to which astronomical science had attained even so early as the time of Meton. The length of the average year is 365 d. 5 h. 48' 48". In nineteen years, therefore, there are

$$19 \times 365 \text{ d. } 5 \text{ h. } 48' 48'' = 6939 \text{ d. } 14 \text{ h. } 27' 12''.$$

The average lunation, or lunar month, contains 29 d. 12 h. 44' 3"; consequently, two hundred and thirty-five such lunations will contain :—

$$235 \times 29 \text{ d. } 12 \text{ h. } 44' 3'' = 6939 \text{ d. } 16 \text{ h. } 31' 45''.$$

It appears, therefore, that two hundred and thirty-five lunations are longer than nineteen years by just 2 h. 4' 33"; so that Meton was right in saying that, after nineteen years the lunar phases would again occur on the same days of the months; but, for complete accuracy, he should have added that they would occur 2 h. 4' 33" later in the day. If, for example, the first new moon of 432 B.C. fell on the 1st January, at 10 a.m., in the year 413 B.C. the new moon would have fallen on the 1st January; but at four and a-half minutes past noon, and at two hours and nine minutes past noon in 394 B.C., and so on. Thus it will be seen that after the lapse of twelve cycles, the lunar phases would not occur for an entire day after the dates indicated by the Cycle of Golden Numbers.

But we must bear in mind, that up to the time of the Gregorian reform of the calendar the average year was reckoned as consisting of exactly three hundred and sixty-five days six hours. Therefore, a cycle of nineteen years contained:—

$$19 \times 365 \text{ d. } 6 \text{ h.} = 6939 \text{ d. } 18 \text{ h.};$$

so that two hundred and thirty-five lunations, amounting, as we have just seen to 6939 d. 16 h. 31' 45" was 1 h. 28' 15" shorter than nineteen years.¹ It might seem that so small a discrepancy, repeated only after the lapse of nineteen years, might be entirely neglected. But, small though it is, when allowed to accumulate it amounts to a day in about three hundred and ten years. And it was allowed to accumulate

¹ It should, however, be remarked that the manner in which the lunations of the calendar have always been reckoned makes two hundred and thirty-five lunations, exactly equal in duration to nineteen Julian years of three hundred and sixty-five and a-quarter days each. It is not so easy to make this clear. However, the following attempt should be fairly intelligible:—In reckoning the time of a lunation, the calendar neglects entirely the minutes and seconds, and makes twenty-nine and a-half days the average time. But, to avoid fractions, thirty and twenty-nine days are given to alternate lunations, those which terminate in the odd months of the year, namely, January, March, May, &c., getting thirty; and those which terminate in the even months, twenty-nine. In leap-years the lunation terminating in March gets an additional day, and in these years, therefore, has thirty-one days. Hence in the common lunar year, consisting of six months of thirty days, and six of twenty-nine days each, there are just three hundred and fifty-four days. And nineteen such lunar years will therefore contain

$$354 \text{ d.} \times 19 = 6726 \text{ d.}$$

But the common solar year of three hundred and sixty-five days has eleven days more than the lunar year; and nineteen common solar years, neglecting leap-years for the present, have $19 \times 11 = 209$ days more than nineteen lunar years of twelve months each. These two hundred and nine days are distributed in the following manner:—As often as the excess of the solar over the lunar year accumulates to thirty days or upwards, a lunar month of thirty days is intercalated. This intercalation takes place seven times in the cycle of nineteen years, as may easily be shown, and the years of the cycle in which it takes place are the third, sixth, ninth, eleventh, fourteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth. For after three years the excess of the solar over the lunar year amounts to $3 \times 11 = 33$ days. When the intercalary month of thirty days is taken from this accumulated excess three days remain, which are carried forward. At the end of the sixth year the excess amounts to $3 \times 11 + 3 = 36$ days; and when thirty days are dropped six remain. These six, together with the constant excess of eleven days in each year, will produce an excess of thirty-nine days at the

during the one thousand two hundred and fifty-seven years that elapsed between the Council of Nice and the reformation of the calendar by Gregory XIII.; so that at the latter date the lunar phases happened four entire days before the dates indicated by the Golden Numbers. This, then, was another error which Pope Gregory had to correct. The removal of the accumulated error of four days was a very simple process, as it was only necessary to raise the Golden Numbers four lines in the new calendar. This was all the more easy, because these numbers had to be disturbed at any rate; for, owing to the omission of the ten nominal days, it was necessary to lower the Golden Numbers ten lines. But it was not quite so easy to find a means by which the Golden Numbers might be permanently availed of for the purpose

end of the ninth year. From this a remainder of nine days is left after the intercalary month has been deducted. At the end of the tenth year, therefore, the excess is $9+11=20$, and at the end of the eleventh it is $20+11=31$. Consequently, the third intercalation takes place in the eleventh year of the cycle, and leaves one to be carried forward. In the same way it may be shown that the intercalation takes place in the fourteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth years; but the intercalary month in the nineteenth year must have only twenty-nine instead of thirty days. Of the seven intercalary months occurring in nineteen years, therefore, six have thirty days each, and the seventh twenty-nine. Adding these together we have

$$6 \times 30 + 29 = 209 \text{ days.}$$

For the duration of two hundred and thirty-five lunations we have now reckoned

$$6726 + 209 = 6935 \text{ days.}$$

But nineteen Julian years, as we have seen, have six thousand nine hundred and thirty-nine days eighteen hours; we still, therefore, require four days eighteen hours, or four and three-quarter days to make the time of two hundred and thirty-five lunations correspond with nineteen Julian years. These days we can easily find. It has been stated in this note that the lunation terminating in March has thirty-one days in a leap-year. Now, in nineteen years there are sometimes five and sometimes four leap-years. Hence two hundred and thirty-five lunations have sometimes $6935+5=6940$ days, and sometimes $6935+4=6939$ days. When the first, second, or third year of the cycle is a leap-year, there are five such years in the cycle, and when the fourth is a leap-year there are but four. In a period, then, of four cycles, five days will be added three times on account of the leap-years, and four days only once; or in the entire four cycles there will be $3 \times 5 + 4 = 19$ days added on account of the leap-years. This gives for each cycle an average of four and three-quarter days, or four days eighteen hours, which, being added to the six thousand nine hundred and thirty-five days already obtained, makes

$$6935 + 4\frac{3}{4} = 6939\frac{3}{4} \text{ days, or } 6939 \text{ days } 18 \text{ hours.}$$

for which they were first intended, namely, for indicating the lunar phases. For, as we have seen, in a period of about three hundred and ten years these phases would occur a full day earlier than the Golden Numbers indicated. On this account, therefore, it would be necessary to raise the Golden Numbers one line in every three hundred and ten years. Moreover, the Cycle of Golden Numbers was constructed to suit the Julian calendar; and, as the new calendar omitted in every four hundred years three days which the Julian calendar retained, another change in the Golden Numbers would have been required. For after each century year, not a leap-year, it would be necessary to lower the Golden Numbers one line. Having taken these complicated and irregular changes into consideration, Clavius, in compiling the new calendar, dropped the Cycle of Golden Numbers altogether, and invented and introduced in its stead the Cycle of Epacts.

(To be continued.)

1. SHOULD THE "LAUS TIBI CHRISTE," BE SUNG BY THE CHOIR IN A SOLEMN MASS?
2. THE PRAYER TO BE SAID IN BLESSING THE GRAVE.
3. THE DAYS ON WHICH SOLEMN REQUIEM MASS "PRAESENTE CADAVERE" IS FORBIDDEN.
4. ORDER OF LIGHTING AND EXTINGUISHING THE CANDLES ON THE ALTAR.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly state in the pages of the I. E. RECORD what should be done in the following cases, and greatly oblige,
"SACERDOS."

"1. In a 'Missa Solemni vel Cantata,' should the choir answer 'Laus Tibi Christe,' at the end of the Gospel chanted by the deacon or celebrant, or should the acolyte answer as at a low mass?

"2. In 'exsequiis parvulorum,' when the grave is not already blessed, what prayer should be said in blessing it? Must we use the 'Deus cujus miseratione,' &c.?

"3. Enumerate the days on which the 'Missa solemnis vel cantata de Requie,' the body being present in the church, cannot be celebrated. Rubricists do not seem to agree on these days.

“4. On which side of the altar should the acolyte begin to light the candles? Some rubricists say on the Gospel side, while others say the contrary.

1. The words, *Laus tibi Christe*, should not be sung by the choir either in a solemn mass or in a *missa cantata*: they may be said by the assistants as in an ordinary mass, but in a low tone.

2. The prayer *Deus cujus miseratione* is to be used in blessing the grave when the corpse to be interred is that of an infant, as well as when it is of an adult.

3. The reason why rubricists differ in their enumeration of the days on which a solemn requiem mass *praesente cadavere* cannot be said, is, that the rubricists did not all live or write at the same time, and that the Congregation of Rites has from time to time added another to the list of days already included. Thus, in comparatively recent times, the feasts of the Immaculate Conception, of St. Joseph, and of dedication of a church, have been added. The list complete up to the present is as follows:—

(a) The last three days of Holy Week.

(b) The feasts of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, the Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, the Assumption, the Immaculate Conception, St. John the Baptist, St. Joseph, SS. Peter and Paul, All Saints, the chief patron of a place or of a diocese, the titular or patron of a church, and the anniversary of the dedication of a church.

(c) In countries where any of the feasts just mentioned are transferred to the Sundays following, requiem masses are forbidden on these Sundays.

(d) In a church in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed for the Devotion of the Forty Hours, or for any other public cause.

4. When the candles on the altar are lighted by one acolyte, he begins with the candle on the Gospel side; and if more than two candles are to be lighted, he lights first that candle on the Gospel side which is nearest to the centre of the altar; and having lighted all the candles on the Gospel side, he lights those on the Epistle side, beginning in this case also with the candle next the centre of the altar. He

extinguishes the candle in the opposite order; that is, he begins with the candle on the Epistle side farthest from the centre. We have already given in the I. E. RECORD our reasons for considering this the correct order of lighting and extinguishing the candles.

D. O'LOAN.

Correspondence.

THE TEXT "THE JUST MAN FALLS SEVEN TIMES *A DAY*."

"REV. DEAR SIR,—'The just man falls seven times *a day*.' This statement is found in many Catholic books—*v.g.*, *Remembrance for the Living to Pray for the Dead* (Rev. J. Mumford, S.J.), chap. iii. What authority is there for seven times *a day*? In Proverbs xxiv. 16, it is said, 'Shall fall seven times, and shall rise again;' but *a day* is not in the text."

In reply to our respected correspondent, we have no hesitation in saying that the words "*a day*" ought not to stand in the text.

The words, "a just man shall fall seven times," &c., occur in no other part of the Bible than Prov. xxiv. 16; and in that passage the words "*a day*" should not be read. They are wanting in the Hebrew, in the Vulgate, in the Septuagint, in the Greek versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, and in the early fathers who quote the text.

How, then, it will be asked, have the words crept into the text, so as to be quoted, as they undoubtedly are, in not a few pious books? I believe the explanation is to be found in the fact that they are read in the text as quoted by the celebrated Cassian in the thirteenth chapter of his twenty-second Conference. Cassian's work, written in the beginning of the fifth century, has been largely read and used by spiritual writers ever since his time, and so the text as quoted by him may have easily passed into other authors. Be this as it may, the only other authorities for the words "*a day*" are the author of the Greek *Catena*, and a few manuscripts which are not of much critical value.

J. M. R.

Documents.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII. ON THE EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE VATICAN OBSER- VATORY.

MOTU-PROPRIO SANCTISSIMI D. N. LEONIS XIII.; DE VATICANA
SPECULA ASTRONOMICA RESTITUENDA ET AMPLIFICANDA.

Ut mysticam Sponsam Christi, qui lux vera est, in contemp-
tum et invidiam vocarent, tenebrarum filii consuevere in vulgus
eam vecordi calumnia impetere, et, conversa rerum nominumque
ratione et vi, compellare obscuritatis amicam, altricem igno-
rantiae, scientiarum lumini et progressui infensam. At quae
primis ab exordiis Ecclesiae gessit et docuit homines, ea satis
refellunt et coarguunt turpis mendacii impudentiam. Nam
praeter notitiam rerum divinarum, in qua veritatis sola magistra
fuit, praestantiores etiam philosophiae partes, quae summa sta-
tuunt principia et fundamenta scientiarum omnium, quaeve
rationem veritatis detegendae, recteque ac subtiliter disserendi
tradunt, vel animi vim ac facultates explicant, aut in vitam
hominum moresque inquirunt, ita per Doctores suos excoluit et
illustravit, ut difficile sit novum aliquid memoria dignum iis
adiicere, periculosum sit ab iis discedere.

Summa praeterea laus est Ecclesiae, quod iuris prudentiam
perfecerit atque expolierit, nec ulla delebit oblivio quantum ipsa
contulit doctrinis, exemplis et institutis suis ad implexas quae-
siones expediendas, in quibus scriptores haerent scientiarum, quae
oeconomicae et *sociales* audiunt. Interim vero ne illas quidem
neglexit disciplinas quae in naturae eiusque virium exploratione
versantur. Scholas namque condidit et musea instruxit, quo
penitius illas iuventus addisceret, suosque inter filios et adminis-
tros egregios habuit earum cultores, quos ope sua adiutos et
ornatos honore ad ea studia impensius colenda excitavit.

Eminet in hoc scientiarum numero *astronomia*, quippe cui ea
proposita sunt vestiganda, quae prae ceteris inanimis rebus
enarrant gloriam Dei; ac virorum omnium sapientissimum miri-
fice delectabant, qui lumine divinitus indito nosse se laetabatur
imprimis "*anni cursus et stellarum dispositiones*" (Sap. vii. 19.)

Porro ad curanda huius scientiae incrementa et fovendos cultores eius illud quoque incitamento fuit Ecclesiae Pastoribus, quod huius unius ope certo possint constituti dies, quibus celebrari oporteat ea quae maxima et religiosissima sunt mysteriorum Christi solemnia. Quo factum est, ut Tridentini Patres qui probe noverant perturbatam esse rationem temporum, quae non satis commode, Iulio Caesare auctore, fuerat emendata, rogarunt enixe Romanum Pontificem ut, viris doctissimis in consilium adhibitis, novam ac perfectiorem conficeret annorum dierumque ordinationem.

Quanta fuerit in ea re gerenda Gregorii XIII. Praedecessoris Nostri diligentia, constantia et liberalitas satis compertum est ex indubiis historiae monumentis. Scilicet in ea quae aptissima videbatur parte Vaticanarum aedium speculatoriam turrin excitari iussit, quam instrumentis ornavit, quae ferebat aetas illa maxima et accuratissima, ibique conventus habuit doctorum hominum quos Calendario restituendo praefecerat. Manet adhuc ea turris munifici auctoris sui illustria praeseferens indicia, extatque in ea linea meridiana constructa ab Egnatio Danti Perusino, eique marmorea tabula rotunda interiecta, cuius signa scienter exarata demissis ex alto radiis icta solis, necessitatem emendandae veteris rationis temporum et consentientem rerum naturae restitutionem peractam demonstrant.

Haec turris, monumentum nobile Pontificis de scientiis ac litteris optime meriti, ad pristinum caelestium observationum usum post diutinam intermissionem revocata est imperio et auspicio Pii VI., flectente ad exitum saeculo superiore. Tum cura et studio Philippi Gili, urbani Antistitis aliae etiam adiectae sunt explorationes, quae vim magneticam, tempestates aeris vitamque plantarum spectarent. Ast eo demortuo docto et industrio viro, anno huius saeculi vicesimo primo, templum hoc scientiae astronomicae neglectum desertumque fuit; nam brevi postea Pii VII. mors est insecuta, Leonis autem XII. curas ad se convertit grandius inceptum scientiarum omnium complectens incrementum et decus, nova nimirum instauratio rationis studiorum in Pontificia ditione universa. Hanc ab immortalis Decessore suo cogitatam perfecit ille feliciter, datis Litteris Apostolicis quarum initium: "*Quod divina sapientia.*" Ibi nonnulla graviter constituit de speculis astronomicis, de observationibus assidue peragendis, de descriptione ephemeridum, quae explorata referrent, deque studio adhibendo, ut quae ab exteris detecta forent nostratibus innotescerent.

Si Vaticana turris posthabita est quum aliae in Urbe instructae suppeterent, id ex eo profectum videtur, quod qui tunc rerum huiusmodi peritia praestabant, huic turri obesse censerent vicinas aedes, maximeque obiectum tholi praecelsi qui Vaticanum templum coronat. Hinc illae potiores speculae videbantur quae caelum ex aliis editis locis circumspectant. Postquam vero ea loca cum reliqua Urbe in alienam potestatem devenere, agentibus Nobis quinquagesimum primum sacerdotii Nostri natalem diem, plura cum aliis muneribus oblata sunt instrumenta, affabre facta, quae cultoribus physices caelestis, aerae et terrestris usui sunt; atqui nullam illis aptiorem sedem tribui posse viri physicae scientiae peritissimi putaverunt prae ea, quam Gregorius XIII. iis quodammodo paravisse in Vaticana turri videbatur. Quum ea sententia Nobis probata esset; ipsa aedificii natura, veteris gloriae eius memoria, et collecta suppellex, non secus ac vota virorum prudentia et doctrina praestantium, Nobis suasere, ut iuberemus eam speculam restitui, rebusque omnibus ornari et instrui, per quae non modo astronomiae studiis esset profutura, sed etiam pervestigationibus physicae terrestris, et pernoscendis phaenomenis quae in aerea regione contingunt. Quod porro amplitudini prospectus deesse videbatur ut quoquoersus pateret latissime ad sidera eorumque motus explorandos, id commode praestitit vicinitas *Leoniani propugnaculi* veteri soliditate nobilis, cuius turris editissima in vertice collis vaticani assurgens maximas praebet opportunitates, ut inde astrorum observatio plenissima sit et numeris omnibus absoluta. Hanc itaque adiutricem addidimus Gregoriana speculae, eoque deferri iussimus ingens optices instrumentum quod *aequatoriale* dicunt, ad photographicas siderum imagines excipiendas comparatum.

Ad haec gnaros sollertesque viros selegimus, quorum ministerio ea omnia praestarentur quae suscepti operis natura flagitat, iisque praefecimus virum rei astronomicae et physicae scientissimum, *P. Franciscum Denza* ex Clericis Regularibus S. Pauli Barnabitis nuncupatis. Horum industria freti libenter annuimus Vaticanam speculam in societatem partemque operis vocari cum aliis praeclarissimis Institutis rei astronomicae provehendae addictis, quibus propositum est tabulas photographicas conficere quae totius caeli, prout nitet, frequentibus stellis conspersum, accurate imaginem referant. Quum autem susceptum a Nobis opus in hac specula restituenda non brevi interire, sed perpetuum fieri optemus, legem ei dedimus quae regulas praescribit, quas in

rebus ibi gerendis ac ministeriis obeundis servari volumus. Consilium praeterea constituimus virorum lectissimorum penes quod summa sit totius rei moderatio, et maxima post Nostram potestas in iis quae spectant internum eius ordinem decernendis.

Iamvero hanc legem et hoc Consilium, non secus ac delationem variorum munerum et reliqua quae hucusque iussu vel consensu Nostro circa Vaticanam speculam acta sunt, per hasce Litteras solemniter confirmamus, eamque in eodem ordine haberi volumus cum aliis Pontificiis Institutis quae scientiarum colendarum causa condita sunt. Imo quo firmiter operis stabilitati consulamus, pecuniae vim eidem attribuimus cuius redditus sumptus eidem servando tuendoque decenter necessarios suppeditet. Tametsi magis quam humanis praesidiis, illud tectum iri florensque fore confidimus favore et ope omnipotentis Dei; namque in eo aggrediendo non modo incrementis studuimus scientiae prae nobilis, quae mortalium animos prae ceteris humanis disciplinis ad rerum caelestium contemplationem erigit, sed illud praecipue animo intendimus quod ab ipsis Nostri Pontificatus exordiis constanter, ubi data est occasio, verbis, scriptis rebusque gestis praestare adnisi sumus, curare scilicet, ut omnibus persuasum sit, Ecclesiam eiusque Pastores, prout initio diximus, non odisse veram solidamque scientiam cum divinarum tum humanarum rerum, sed eam complecti et fovere, et qua valent ope studiose provehere.

Omnia igitur quae Litteris hisce Nostris statuimus et declaravimus, rata et firma, uti sunt, ita in posterum esse volumus ac iubemus, irritumque et inane futurum decernimus, siquid super his a quoquam contigerit attentari, contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xiv. Martii anno MDCCCXCI., Pontificatus Nostri decimo quarto.

LEO PP., XIII.

Notices of Books.


SHORT INSTRUCTIONS IN THE ART OF SINGING PLAIN-CHANT, WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING ALL VESPER PSALMS AND THE MAGNIFICAT, THE RESPONSES FOR VESPERS, THE ANTIPHONS OF THE B.V.M., AND VARIOUS HYMNS FOR BENEDICTION. Designed for the use of Catholic Choirs and Schools. By T. Singenberger. Third Revised and Enlarged Edition, 1888. New York and Cincinnati. Fr. Pustet & Co. Price 25 cents.

THIS little booklet shows the practical American. Having set about writing short instructions on Plain-Chant, for the use of Catholic choirs and schools, he confines himself well to his purpose, and comprises, within thirty-seven pages, such information on the subject, as will prove useful for the readers it is intended for. The author has largely drawn upon Haberl's *Magister Choralis* far more than his occasional reference to that book would make the reader suppose. This, however, does not, of course, interfere with the usefulness of the booklet. Speaking generally, we cannot but approve fully of the manner in which the subject is dealt with. But, starting from the principle that in a school-book, above all things, everything should be clear and correct, we have to make a few objections.

§ 5 deals with the *notes*; § 6 with the *tones* and *scales*. This order should be inverted. For, as in the order of nature, the *thing* precedes the *sign*, so it should also in the order of treatment. The quotation on page 5 is not from St. Benedict, but from Pope Benedict XIV.

The names of the notes are given in the following order: *c, d, e, f, g, a, b, c*. We think it would be more reasonable to give them thus: *a, b, c, d, e, f, g, a*. The pupil would then at once see that these names are the first seven letters of the Alphabet, and would have no difficulty in remembering them. The method of beginning with *c* is the result of an over-estimation of the modern major scale, which is too common indeed in our days, but from which a writer on Gregorian chant should be free. The distinction between singing *false* and *incorrectly*, given in § 11, will probably seem to an Englishman just as unwarranted as to a German Haberl's distinction of the German words of which those are the translation

We cannot recommend the exercises given for striking the intervals. It were better had they been omitted. The rule for pronouncing the diphthongs, given in § 12, 2, is neither clear nor correct. That E, in Latin, before consonants in general is pronounced as *e* in *met* (§ 13, 1), and that *Ui* is a diphthong in *huic* and *cui*, is a new teaching, as far as we know. For the consonants, the general rule is given: *pronounce them as they are written*. It would be difficult to pronounce an *l*, for instance, straight, or a *c* round, or a *g* crooked. The writer meant, of course, that they should be pronounced as in English.

In § 15 the author gives the following form of the Podatus: . It must be mentioned that, since 1883, at least, this form is not used in the official editions. As to the execution of the neumes, the author would, in a future edition, better adopt the rules given by Haberl in the ninth edition of his *Magister Choralis*. On page 27 the author says that "the authentic modes generally go one tone below their final, and the plagals one tone above." Above the final? In § 17, after explaining that monosyllables and Hebrew words sometimes cause a change in the mediation of a Psalm-tone, the author enumerates amongst "such words" also *usquequo*. As this is not a monosyllable, it is, in all probability, a Hebrew word! The expression in § 20, "a proximate or remote, anterior or posterior celebration," will not convey to the reader the idea the author had evidently before his mind. The explanation of the distinction between *feriae majores* and *minores* will surprise liturgists. At page 34 we read: "the special *Alleluja* is repeated in the *neuma*." Probably it should be "with the *neuma*."

In the appendix we have, what the liturgical books call the *Communio Vespertalis*, the *Deus in adjutorium*, the Psalm-tones, the tones of the versicle, &c. Then there are all the Vesper Psalms, marked according to Father Mohr's system. According to this system, as probably most of our readers know, the numbers 1-8 are placed over the syllables of the psalm verses, indicating on which particular syllable the mediation or ending of each of the eight Psalm-tones is to begin. This will prove useful to many choirs.

The book is not for students preparing for priesthood. But for choirs and schools we can recommend it.

H. B.

THE ROMAN MISSAL AND SUPPLEMENT, ADAPTED TO THE
USE OF THE LAITY. London: R. Washbourne.

WE think it a loss that our people are not more frequently and earnestly encouraged to use the Roman missal at Mass. Such a practice would have the effect of uniting one more closely with the priest at the altar, and with the Church as she follows her saints from day to day with special feast and prayer. This loss is the greater in the case of the educated, who would gradually learn to admire the spirit of wisdom and love guiding the Church in her distribution of the ecclesiastical year, and who would be capable of appreciating and of profiting by the simple beauty and suggestiveness of her prayers. Is it not a pity that our intelligent, well-educated boys are not made familiar with the daily ritual of the Mass in so easy and attractive a way?

At all events, those who are anxious to avail themselves of this practice can have no difficulty in finding a complete Roman Missal in English at a moderate price, and in a most convenient form. Such is the Roman Missal just published by Washbourne, London.

OUR LADY'S GARDEN OF ROSES. Translated from the German
by Rev. F. J. Levaux, S.J. Dublin: Duffy.

THE translator, Fr. Levaux, is a Belgian Jesuit, who has been staying for some time at Miltown Park, Dublin. He writes in his preface: "We offer *Our Lady's Garden of Roses* to the kind-hearted friends we have met in the Emerald Isle, whose chivalrous patriotism and deeply-rooted faith we appreciate, though we can never sufficiently praise. May our little offering betoken the warm feelings of sympathy and affection which the sight of that Irish patriotism and faith arouses in the heart of a Walloon Catholic."

Fr. Levaux could make no more acceptable offering to the people among whom he is sojourning; for they love, above all devotions, their Rosary. And *Our Lady's Garden of Roses* is a charming little book on the Rosary.

In the opening chapters we have a history of the origin and progress of this devotion, of the testimonies to its efficacy as a prayer borne by the words and practice of saints, and the commendations and favours of successive Pontiffs, and by the uninterrupted hold it has had on the hearts of all Catholic countries.

The second part of the little book instructs us how easy - is to meditate on the mysteries of the Rosary ; and in the last part we have an explanation of the indulgences and the conditions to be observed for profiting by our Rosary. It is quite a charming little book.

ABRIDGED BIBLE HISTORY. THE CHILD'S BIBLE HISTORY.
Freiburg and St. Louis : Herder.

MESSRS. HERDER have published in English a little Bible history of about one hundred pages, specially suited to children. Indeed, either of the books mentioned above is a model child's book. The story is clearly and pithily told ; the type is bold and good ; and, instead of the usual daubs to be found in children's school-books, we have artistic wood-cuts that will interest the little reader, and help to cultivate the youthful taste. The little books have the approval of several bishops.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS.

MONTH after month this excellent society is adding to the number of its publications. Among those recently issued are the *Life of Blessed Juvenal Ancina*, by Fr. Morris, S.J. ; *Life of Tita, a Domestic Servant*, by Lady Herbert ; *Little Helpers of the Holy Souls* ; *School Savings Banks*, by Miss Agnes Lambert ; *Catholic Clubs*, by J. Britten ; *The Drink Traffic* ; *a Poor Man's Notion of the Church* ; *The Holy Coat of Treves*, by Canon Moyers (price one penny each) ; a bound volume containing a *Life of Archbishop Ullathorne*, and eight papers on practical Catholic topics ; and a little book of exceptional interest, being some of the catechetical instructions, translated into English, of St. Cyril of Alexandria.

If it be a good work—and who can doubt it?—to spread among the people a really Catholic literature, excellent in matter and form, and suitable to all classes in its variety—then we commend earnestly to our readers the diffusion of the Catholic Truth Society's publications.

IRISH Ecclesiastical Record.
July-Dec. 1891.
THIRD SERIES.

1891
3909
v.12

BX 801 .I68 1891 Pt.2 SMC
The Irish ecclesiastical
record 47085658

Does Not Circulate

